DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 297 733 IR 051 914

TITLE User Needs and Education Task Force. Final Report.
INSTITUTION California Univ., Santa Barbara. University Library.
PUB DATE Jun 86
NOTE 200p.; For reports from other task forces, see IR 051 910-913.
PUB TYPE Viewpoints (120) -- Reports - Evaluative/Feasibility (142) -- Tests/Evaluation Instruments (160)

EDRS PRICE MF01/PC08 Plus Postage.
DESCRIPTORS *Academic Libraries; *Access to Information; Higher Education; *Library Instruction; *Library Planning; *Library Services; Self Evaluation (Groups); Surveys; *User Needs (Information); User Satisfaction (Information); Use Studies
IDENTIFIERS *University of California Santa Barbara

ABSTRACT

This study investigated four general areas of concern at the University of California, Santa Barbara (UCSB) Library: (1) the characteristics of the library's present and future user population and the identification of its needs; (2) the role and program configuration of user education in the future; (3) methods for increasing user awareness of library programs; and (4) user satisfaction with current services and the identification of additional user services appropriate to the library's role in the future. Study methodology included surveying users and staff members and interviewing consultants in user education. UCSB Library users and their needs, user education/library instruction, and user awareness are discussed, and several recommendations are presented for each area. Statistical results of the user and staff surveys and a 121-item bibliography are also provided. Appendices include: (1) the task force action plan; (2) the user survey response rate; (3) definitions of the study's statistical terminology; (4) UCSB online search statistics; (5) a listing of user education resource persons; (6) user education interview questions; (7) a listing of courses in which course-related library instruction is presented; (8) the user and staff survey instruments and summaries of responses to the open-ended questions; (9) a listing of 57 UCSB Library publications; and (10) a summary tabulation of comments received in the library suggestion box. (KM)

****
* Reproductions supplied by EDRS are the best that can be made *
* from the original document. *
****

ED297733

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION
Office of Educational Research and Improvement
EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)

X This document has been reproduced as received from the person or organization originating it.

☐ Minor changes have been made to improve reproduction quality.

• Points of view or opinions stated in this document do not necessarily represent official OERI position or policy.

USER NEEDS AND EDUCATION TASK FORCE

FINAL REPORT

Edward De Walt
Nan Djordjevic
Nancy Dubie
Eugene Graziano
Salvador Guerena
Dennis Hamilton
Ann Hefferman
Lynette Korenic, Chair
Laura Nanna

University Library
University of California
Santa Barbara, CA
Revised June 1986

IR051914

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

"PERMISSION TO REPRODUCE THIS MATERIAL HAS BEEN GRANTED BY

Joseph Boisse

TO THE EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)."

ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

The Task Force would like to thank all the other people who worked on this project:

Dick Berk
Valerie Jenness
Susan Lentz
Wendi Reed
Erica Scranton
Lucia Snowhill
Bill Treese

And the many other students who lent a hand.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

Executive Summary 1

Recommendations 3

Introduction 9

Methodology 11

Section I: User Description and Needs 14

Section II: User Education/Library Instruction 54

Section III: User Awareness 78

Appendixes

I	Action Plan	85
II	User Survey Response Rate	89
II	Statistical Terminology	90
IV	UCSB Online Search Statistics	91
V	User Education Resource List	93
VI	User Education Interview Questions	95
VII	Course-related Instruction	96
VIII	User Survey--Open-ended Questions	98
IX	Staff Survey--Open-ended Questions	109
X	UCSB Library Publications	111
XI	Suggestion Box Comments	117

User Education Bibliography 119

User and Staff Survey Statistics after bibliography

EXECUTIVE SUMMARY

The Task Force was charged to investigate and consider four general areas of concern: the description of our present and future user population and the identification of its needs; the role and program configuration of user education in the future; methods for increasing user awareness of Library programs; user satisfaction with current services; and the identification of additional user services appropriate to the Library's role in the future.

The Task Force obtained data from several sources including surveys of both users and staff, statistics from Library department annual reports, literature, discussion and interviews.

The Library's primary users are the faculty and students of this campus. They have a variety of needs and operate within an environment of constant change which includes growing receptivity to computer technology, increasingly sophisticated research, and a steadily increasing student and faculty population. These, along with the University's effort to make UCSB a major research institution will place new and greater demands on the Library's resources and services.

The Task Force made some calculated assumptions about the future. Undergraduates will come to the University with greater academic skill and computer literacy than their predecessors, but will lack experience with academic libraries. Graduates will do research in narrow topics that will increasingly draw from multiple disciplines and they will rely on a variety of interdisciplinary resources; they will expect to make more intensive use of computer technology. Faculty too will do research that is increasingly interdisciplinary; they will also make greater use of computers. All of the Library's constituency will need additional assistance in accessing the growing quantity and variety of Library resources, both traditional and technological.

Though many users expressed satisfaction with the Library's services, others complained about the current situation, in particular about space, noise, slow response time and incompleteness of the MELVYL catalog, and the insufficient number of functioning copy machines. Others looked forward to an online catalog with all local holdings that are accessible from their offices or homes, remote access to circulation and other Library databases, and a document delivery system. A close examination of the data that the Task Force collected reveals weaknesses in both the

relationship and in the interactions of the Library with its constituency. It indicates the need to develop a dynamic, coherent and carefully tailored program to make the constituency aware of Library services. It also reveals the need to redeploy staff and resources to support a revitalized and diversified program of user education. The staff must be reeducated to meet the needs of the user. The quality of the reeducation will be the greatest single factor in the success of new user services and on the users' image of the Library.

RECOMMENDATIONS

A. User Needs and Description

The Task Force recommends the following:

1. that the Library establish a tailored and comprehensive user education program as detailed in section II of this report.

2. that the Library establish a revitalized promotion and awareness program as detailed in section III of this report.

3. that the Library take a proactive role on campus and through leadership and high visibility establish strong cooperative relationships with its primary constituency (the faculty in particular).

4. that, as part of the leadership role, the Library support a comprehensive staff development program which would include training in library technology, as well as training in patron interaction techniques.

5. that the Library consider offering a series of workshops for public services staff which would include instruction in interviewing techniques, online search strategies, attitude and image projection, communication techniques, stress management, and confidence building techniques.

6. that the Library provide the appropriate resources (collection development) and equipment needed to support teaching and research on campus, thereby assisting the University in attracting the best faculty and student body possible.

7. that the Library acquire an online catalog that contains all local holdings, cataloged and in-process, and has boolean logic with key-word search capabilities, and an efficient response time.

8. that the Library work to provide remote access to the Library online systems, including the catalog, circulation records, serials records and acquisition records.

9. that the Library establish a comprehensive, integrated reference collection for the Main Library's Humanities and Social Sciences materials, housed in one location to provide better access and instructional use by Library staff.

10. that the Library establish a Reference Librarian Roundtable to discuss new resources, changes in scholarly research, applications of developing technologies, and the formation of constituency relationships.

11. that the Library provide equipment of sufficient quality and quantity for the patron's information processing needs (i.e., copy machines, printers, word processors, typewriters, microform readers).

12. that the Library provide end-user access to all available non-commercial databases at a central location (i.e., at all appropriate reference desks): RLIN, OCLC, ORION, UCSB online catalog.

13. that the Library keep up with developing technologies related to access to external resources (especially with Interlibrary Loan).

14. that the Library consider the user's need (especially undergraduates) for study space and a quiet environment a top priority issue to be addressed in the planning of the new Library addition and the redesign of the present building.

15. that the Library negotiate with the campus administration to provide additional study space for students somewhere else on campus.

16. that the Library consider the use of a professional, objective, outside consultant for periodic evaluation of Library programs on an ongoing basis.

17. that the Library establish an ongoing evaluation process to periodically evaluate the users' needs and the Library's success in meeting those needs.

B. User Education

The Task Force recommends the following:

1. that the Library adopt and implement the concept of the "teaching library" as defined and described in section II.

2. that a new, expanded, improved, and comprehensive program of instructional services be planned and implemented at this Library, and that it be evaluated on an ongoing basis. The program should be tailored and offered to these four groups of users: the undergraduate students, the graduate students, the

faculty and academic staff, and the campus administration and staff.

3. that the program be offered to our users as a practical program of educational support services which should be integrated into the campus' educational goals and which would assist in improving the quality of instruction and learning, in support of an academic research environment, which promotes independent study and lifelong learning.

4. that the instructional program be developed in collaboration with the academic community so that each component effectively meets the academic needs of the faculty and students.

5. that the Library aggressively seek faculty support and cooperation in the development of a new program of instructional services.

6. that the program configuration be integrated into the rest of the Library's public services and that the educational aspects of all the Library's public services be integrated and coordinated as one functioning whole.

7. that the Library take an inter-campus perspective in planning and implementing educational services that will facilitate direct user access to information via the UCSB campus' and Library's current and future information access systems and services.

8. that a strong conceptual framework be built into the entire content of the program and that a greater emphasis be placed on teaching beginning and advanced library research skills, information handling skills, problem solving skills, and critical thinking skills. Each component or activity of the program should incorporate cognitive and behavioral learning theory into its instructional design, teaching methodology and learning materials. Interdisciplinary 1 - Library Skills, and the Interdisciplinary 100 - Library Research Bibliography 1 credit courses should be completely redesigned to reflect this new approach.

9. that the first order of business in developing a user-centered program of instructional services is to educate or reeducate the public services staff so that the professional attitudes and philosophy of service towards our users are uniformly positive and consistently displayed throughout the Library.

10. that a separate instructional services unit, made up of staff who have specified responsibilities for

instruction, be established by the Library administration.

11. that a full-time Coordinator of Instructional Services be designated for the Library to insure that the user education program offered to our users is a unified and cohesive one. It is recommended that the Coordinator be a librarian with administrative duties that parallel those at the Berkeley and Irvine campuses.

12. that the Library administration appoint an Instructional Services Coordinating Committee.

13. that the Library administration reallocate existing staff resources to support a new and improved user education program.

14. that, in the future, the Library should recruit new staff with the expectation that they be assigned instructional responsibilities as appropriate to each position.

15. that adequate support staff be provided to assist the library-wide program of instructional services.

16. that, before each component or activity of the program is introduced, there must be careful planning which includes written statements of measurable instructional objectives and desired learning outcomes.

17. that the Library's program take a long-range approach to developing and implementing instruction which supports the programs and interdisciplinary studies on campus.

18. that the Library administration immediately begin initial planning and implementation of the expanded and improved user education program described in section II.

19. that the new and improved program of user education be aggressively promoted and well publicized so that the users are made aware of the Library's educational role on this campus.

C. Awareness and Promotion

The Task Force recommends the following:

1. that the Library establish a first floor information center near the front entrance, equipped with

promotional tools from each service department, in a variety of formats, from the printed to the electronic.

2. that awareness enhancement be constructed on a foundation of menus in published, audio/video media and computer formats.

3. that these menus provide different levels of sophistication, complexity, focus, and scope, and be targeted for various kinds of users.

4. that particular attention be given to promoting awareness in the following multidisciplinary areas which were frequently identified with low awareness in the survey responses: Special Collections, Interlibrary Loan, microforms, online searching, library instruction, and Government Publications.

5. that an expanded and comprehensive library guides publication program be planned and implemented, with emphasis on achieving multiple levels of complexity and detail in the publications.

6. that Library publications include more subject-specific bibliographies and guides.

7. that the Library establish a publications file and collect sample publications from other institutions on a regular basis.

8. that the Library provide a personnel resource directory for user consultation (i.e., names and location of librarians and support staff specialists).

9. that the Library's signage, floor directories and floor maps be redesigned for greater effectiveness.

10. that menu-driven computerized video programs be provided in public areas to explain Library services in different levels of detail.

11. that promotion, awareness, and orientation materials be placed in student enrollment packets, particularly those of freshmen.

12. that awareness presentations to classes in academic departments be highly specialized, and be coordinated with the faculty involved.

13. that subject-specific Library tours be offered to students.

14. that the Library collaborate with the Student Activities Planning Committee to promote awareness of Library programs.

15. that the Library use campus publications (i.e., Nexus and Campus) to promote awareness of Library services and resources.

16. that the Library use KCSB to advertise special Library events (i.e., Corle Book Collection Contest, Friends of the Library book sales, Special Exhibits, and user seminars).

17. that the Coordinator of Instructional Services be responsible for coordinating awareness and promotion activities.

INTRODUCTION

The User Needs and Education Task Force was charged to investigate and consider four general areas of concern:

> the description of our present and future user population and the identification of its needs;
>
> the role and program configuration of user education in the future;
>
> methods for increasing user awareness of Library programs;
>
> user satisfaction with current services and the identification of additional user services appropriate to the Library's role in the future.

In clarifying the objectives of its charge, the Task Force determined that it would study services in relation to the information needs of its primary constituency--the students and faculty at UCSB. The Task Force sought to answer such questions as what the Library can do to meet the needs of its users, what ways users feel the Library can better meet their needs, and how the Library can inform its users of its services and resources. Thus, the Task Force did not set out to investigate other types of constituency needs such as study space, noise control, and copy services. These needs, however, shaped user perception of the Library's ability to satisfy information needs.

Although the Task Force was concerned primarily with the information needs of its users, it did not perform an evaluation of the collection nor a materials availability study. The Task Force deemed that such investigations would be too time-consuming for its established timeframe and beyond its immediate charge. It did, however, study use of Library materials as they related to the access of information as well as awareness of Library resources. In most cases, the Library's collection is adequately meeting the instructional and research needs of its users. Specific lacunae will be mentioned in the body of this report.

The Task force formulated detailed objectives and formulated methods for meeting these objectives in its action plan (Appendix I).

The four areas of the charge are dealt with in the three major sections of this report. Section I is the description of our present and future users, their current and future needs, and their satisfaction with current services.

Section II is a description of the role and program configuration of user education in the future. Section III is a description of methods for increasing user awareness of Library programs.

METHODOLOGY

The Task Force divided into subgroups to work on individual elements of the charge. Subgroup I worked on a description of our users, their needs, and their satisfaction with current services. Members of this subgroup were Nancy Dubie, Sal Guerena, Ann Hefferman, Lyn Korenic, and Laura Nanna. Their work involved administering a user and a staff survey, and interpreting the results of the statistical findings. Subgroup II, comprised of Ed De Walt and Dennis Hamilton, investigated user education and instructional activities. They interviewed many consultants on user education, performed a literature search, and compiled an extensive bibliography . Subgroup III, made up of Nan Djordjevic and Eugene Graziano, investigated user awareness. They examined the findings from the user and staff surveys and prepared an annotated list of Library publications.

The Task Force met weekly as a full group to discuss progress and to share information and findings. The subgroups also spent much time meeting individually throughout the project. Each subgroup prepared a draft of their section. Revisions were incorporated into the final report.

For the most part, the Task Force followed the methodology outlined in its action plan (Appendix I). Recognizing the vast amount of time needed to administer and analyze surveys, the Task Force carefully examined reports from other institutions involved in the Public Services Study to see if their survey results were worthwhile. This critique allowed the Task Force to avoid some pitfalls in questionnaire design (our surveys are appended). Most notably, the Task Force gained insight into linking questions and answers; it was careful to understand the intent of each question so that the response would provide relevant and useful information. The Task Force developed its relatively short questionnaire with the assistance of Dick Berk, Director of the Social Process Research Institute on campus. Dick Berk and his students later supplied the Task Force with data input and analysis.

The objectives of the user survey were as follows: 1) to identify purposes of Library use, 2) to determine frequency of Library use and causes of non-use, 3) to identify levels of importance of services to users, 4) to determine awareness levels of Library services, 5) to identify user satisfaction/dissatisfaction with present services and causes of ineffective service, 6) to identify needs for further guidance in library use, 7) to identify possible means for increasing user knowledge of Library resources and services, 8) to determine the users' perceptions as to the helpfulness and availability of staff in relation to meeting

their information needs, 9) to identify areas for improvement in Library services, and 10) to determine use of and receptivity to developing technologies in academic and library environments.

The objectives of the staff survey were: 1) to identify staff perception of user awareness of resources and services, 2) to get suggestions for methods of increasing student and faculty awareness of information sources, 3) to determine staff training and awareness needs, 4) to identify user instruction needs, 5) to determine strengths and weaknesses of the current user education program, 6) to identify staff demand for improved technology and Library services, and 7) to identify changing user information needs.

After a careful examination of the survey questions by Dick Berk, the Public Services Study Team, and the Library administration, the Task Force conducted two pre-tests of the user surveys to resolve any problems with survey terminology, length, ambiguity, or layout. The faculty survey contained a slightly different set of questions than the graduate and undergraduate survey. Pre-tests were done using representatives from all three groups.

The surveys were modified and distributed to a random sample of 2805 users (Appendix II). Monetary incentives ($50) for the graduates and the undergraduates helped increase the survey response rate, as did survey reminders mailed to every participant.

The statistical data of the surveys were then coded (to save time this should have been incorporated into the design of the survey) and input into a microcomputer. Wendi Reed, a Sociology graduate student, then analyzed the raw data using the GAUSS statistical package. She supplied the Task Force with frequency counts (appended) as well as cross-tabulations for selected questions. The method for the staff survey was identical to the user survey. Almost 50% of the 196 staff surveys were returned.

It was then the job of the Task Force to present and interpret the survey data. Recognizing the heterogeneity of our users in terms of library use patterns, needs, demands, and awareness and satisfaction levels, the Task Force examined the constituency using a market segmentation approach. This approach helped the Task Force to determine and characterize what is distinctive about the information needs of each group and the way they use the Library.

The User Needs and Education Task Force interacted with the other Task Forces in the following ways: 1) it received input from both the Technology and Access Task Forces regarding questions to be covered on the user and staff surveys, 2) it distributed all statistical frequency counts from the surveys to each Task Force, and 3) it used information regarding Library collections compiled by the Access Task Force.

The methodology for the study of the user education and awareness elements of this charge are discussed in the appropriate sections of this report.

Section I

USER DESCRIPTION AND NEEDS

FINDINGS

INTRODUCTION

The findings of our surveys and investigations reveal an ever changing and growing constituency with increasing demands and expectations on the library of the future to be both traditional and technologically smart. New ways of information production, access, manipulation and distribution are part of the academic and library environments. Boundaries between disciplines are breaking down. Scholars are using electronic technology to approach and store research in new ways. Faculty in all disciplines are developing applications of microcomputers to support research and instruction. Libraries are responding by more complex networking and resource sharing, by providing access to information through sophisticated technology, and by making available online data resources--all of which must share human and financial resources with traditional library research methods. It is a challenge for academic libraries today to develop ways to meet the needs of its constituency in the future and to determine if these needs are being met.

Survey results (except for the cross-tabulations) of the surveys are appended to the report. The cross-tabulations are of such length that we submitted them as a separate reference volume that is available upon request. The large response rate makes these statistics very meaningful. The cross-tabulations were run on selected questions and in most cases match the variable of broad discipline (Humanities, Social Sciences, or Sciences) with another question. The sheer volume of information that resulted from our surveys dictated that we limit our selection and analysis of cross-tabulations. In most cases the cross-tabulations were found to be statistically significant to the degree of .05; these are identified by an asterisk and note on the individual cross-tabulation tables.

This narrative interprets the statistical data from the surveys and presents a description of our present primary constituency, their library use patterns and needs. The statistics measure user perceptions which may differ from reality. User needs may be different from user demands, the satisfaction of which is related to user expectations. It has been stated in the literature on library user studies that users often "ask for the library service they get and get the library service for which they ask...conditioned by what they think they ought to say, or it would be 'reasonable' to say" (Herbert S. White, "The Use and Misuse

of Library User Studies," Library Journal (December 1985),p. 70). For this reason we have weighed the statistical results against our own first-hand knowledge of our users. The majority of staff who answered the survey work over 10 hours a week in direct contact with the public (58% of these were classified staff and 40% were academic). We assume that staff see the trends and patterns of patron use and may have a better perspective of user needs.

The sources of our information were: 1) user survey, 2) staff survey, and 3) existing in-house statistics. The first is influenced by user perception/expectations; the second is based on broad experience in the library field and contact with the users under study, and the third is both voluminous and varied in its record-keeping approach. All proved informative, but a combination of all three sources had many times the value of a single one. When possible, our interpretations and recommendations were based on evidence from more than one source. Our knowledge was extended by a reading of the literature and frequent small group discussion. Even with the massive amounts of evidence in hand, we do not assume that our description of our constituency is complete. At the same time, our acquaintance with our constituency has been greatly enhanced and we find our evidence justification enough for the critical study that follows. We also hope that these statistics will one day be of use for comparative purposes.

The discussion of our findings is organized according to status--undergraduate, graduate, and faculty--and then by broad discipline--Humanities, Social Sciences, and Sciences--within status. There were many reasons for choosing this approach, not the least of which was the common ground that exists within status and discipline and the need to clarify the relationships between the various groups. Furthermore, cross-tabulating our surveys by more than two variables would have dispersed our statistics too widely, making them meaningless and not representative of our total constituency. We have divided our constituency into ten distinct groups: Humanities undergraduates, Social Science undergraduates, Science undergraduates, Undeclared undergraduates, Humanities graduates, Social Science graduates, Science graduates, Humanities faculty, Social Science faculty, and Science faculty. Neither the size of our sample nor our resources permitted us to characterize our constituency in a more stratified or refined manner. We hope, however, that our descriptions are not unconvincing nor characterless, but leave striking impressions in the reader and suggest useful ways of anticipating and planning for the future.

When incorporating statistical data into our report we followed the set of rules shown in Appendix III. Whenever possible, we have phrased our statistical data in fraction

or descriptive form first, followed by actual percentages in parenthesis. When determining frequency of use, we sometimes collapsed the data. For example, use of a service "twice a week" or "at least twice a month" was considered frequent use and use of a service "less than twice a month" or "not used" was considered low use. We attempted to keep in mind that high use of a service may be connected to a particular time during the quarter (i.e., midterms and final exams) and that all services are not equally appropriate to all users.

The two pre-tests helped reduce redundancy and ambiguity in the survey. At the same time we recognize that individuals and groups interpreted the survey questions according to their own situation and library experience. A word such as "importance" may mean "popular and effective" to an undergraduate, while "timely access" to graduates and faculty. We considered these differences of interpretation in our overall approach to the data. The staff survey was used as a check to our user survey findings, and in some cases pointed in an opposite direction. We continually attempted to consider the difference between what users think they need and what staff think users need, and what this tells us about our ability to successfully anticipate and meet users' needs.

UNDERGRADUATES

A. User Description

In the Fall of 1985, at the time of our survey, 15,277 undergraduates were enrolled at UCSB. Since 1975, undergraduate enrollment increased 17%. We can expect the number of undergraduates to continue to climb as UC continues to raise the ceiling on enrollment.

Undergraduates are divided into four academic disciplinary groups: Social Sciences numbering 4815 (32% of total undergraduate population), Sciences numbering 4065 (26%), Undeclareds at 3657 (24%), and Humanities at 2740 (18%).

Comparisons of figures from 1979 to 1984 show increases and decreases in departmental programs. Liberal Studies, Black Studies, Mathematics, Computer Science and Physics have all seen growth rates exceeding 100%. Anthropology, Art Studio, Environmental Studies, Comparative Literature, Combined Sociology and Ergo/PE have the highest rate of declined enrollment.

Surveys were sent to a random sampling of 1068 undergraduates. The respondents generally reflected the same percentages by discipline in the actual population, with a slightly higher percentage of Social Science and

Science respondents and slightly lower percent of Humanities and Undeclareds. Therefore the confidence level for analysis across disciplines is fairly high. One-third of the undergraduate surveys were returned, providing us with a fairly reliable source of opinion and information.

Certain characteristics of UCSB entering freshmen were noted in the 1983-1984 Report on the UCSB Freshmen. Entering freshmen were predominately white from relatively affluent backgrounds. UCSB has attracted these students primarily by its academic reputation, but its social atmosphere was also a contributing factor. UCSB was the first choice campus for more than 80% of the freshmen.

Within a growing national climate of political conservatism, undergraduates seem to be motivated by an educational program which will point them towards a good job and financial security. The most popular career choices among men have been engineering and business, while among women, business and law. Our undergraduates are more likely to seek an advanced degree elsewhere.

A quarter of our entering freshmen acknowledge a need for remedial education in mathematics, and one-tenth need remedial education in English and science.

But according to the 1985-1986 General Catalog for UCSB, certain changes have begun to take place. As of Fall 1986, college entrance requirements have become more stringent. Freshmen are expected to have had more preparation in high school. Those characteristics which described the entering freshmen in 1983-1984 will change accordingly. We can assume that our future undergraduate student population will be better equipped with basic educational skills when they enter college.

The undergraduate status, from entering freshman through graduating senior, is assumed to have certain inherent affects on library use. Most undergraduates spend their freshman through senior years taking general survey and subject-specific courses which require use of their own materials and texts (as opposed to library materials). Course assignments are in the form of lecture notes, text readings, midterm and final exams. This pattern is particularly true for the Sciences and perhaps a little less so for the Humanities and Social Sciences where class assignments may also include the writing of book reviews and short research or seminar papers. Many entering freshmen have had limited exposure to academic libraries in their preparatory years and their level of library skills reflects this inexperience. Most undergraduates live away from home while they attend the University, either in campus dorms or off campus sharing apartments or houses with other

classmates, and are dealing with roommate situations for the first time. The inevitable stresses and distractions of their 'university home' draws them to the Library for the peace and quiet they need for studying. But conversely, many undergraduates also tend to migrate to the Library for 'social' reasons and the traditional peace and tranquillity of a library environment is often replaced by a noisy and crowded 'party' atmosphere, especially during the heavy use periods around exam times.

Undergraduates also tend to be unsophisticated in their use of technology, relying heavily on those devices which will help them to process their work (i.e., typewriters and copy machines) over tools such as automated information retrieval and commercialized database systems. The use of automated information retrieval is a skill that is foreign to most undergraduates.

When compared to the national sampling, UCSB undergraduates are less likely to have had any experience with computers. Survey results indicated that only 13% of our undergraduates already own a computer, though 43% anticipate owning one in the next five to ten years. We can assume that over half (56%) of our undergraduates today will own their own computer in the future. We can expect greater proportions of future classes of undergraduates to own their own computers as computer literacy rises and the purchase price goes down.

More than half of our undergraduates surveyed (60%) have access to a microcomputer. A third of these are using them in the Microcomputer Lab. Thus, the Microcomputer Lab is the primary source of access to microcomputers for undergraduates. Two-thirds of the students in the Sciences have access. One-third of the Undeclareds have no access.

More than half of the undergraduates (60%) have access to a terminal. The Sciences and Social Sciences have the greatest access. Undeclareds have the least amount of access to a terminal. Over one-third (40%) of the undergraduates have no access to a modem. Significant proportions of undergraduates reported not knowing if they had access to microcomputers, terminals, and modems.

B. Use Patterns

In general, the structure of the undergraduate academic program reinforces the tendency of the undergraduates across all disciplines to use the Library mainly as a study hall. They come to the Library to study for their courses using their own materials and texts, as well as for general reading purposes. On a less frequent basis, they use the Library to find course-related information for class assignments which involve some degree of research or

reference work. The Social Science and Humanities majors appear to be slightly more research-oriented, a characteristic which corresponds to these disciplines being more involved with comparative information gathering, at least at the undergraduate level. Undergraduates make infrequent use of materials reserved for their courses, except during the peak periods of midterms and finals. This 'wait till the last minute' approach typifies the average underclassman attitude toward library services in general. By the time they get around to looking up the information they need, they are in a crunch to obtain it right away. This element of procrastination helps to explain why undergraduates still seem to prefer the traditional approaches to library use such as consulting the card catalog and seeking out Library staff for information and guidance. These are approaches that they feel comfortable with and from which they expect to obtain immediate results.

C. How Undergraduate Needs Are Being Met

According to results from the user survey, the most frequently used Library services by undergraduates include circulation services, reference/information service, card catalog and MELVYL catalog assistance. The Reserve Book Service also gets heavy use but only during peak periods. These are all services one would expect undergraduates to be making heavy use of within the context of their academic programs and their traditional experience.

They are generally satisfied with the circulation services, but would like to see some improvements regarding the availability of books that have been checked out. They complain that the academic loan period is too long, information on the user is not available, and that books are not reshelved fast enough. Satisfaction with Reference/Information services is more of a mixed bag. Approximately 40% of the undergraduates felt that Library staff were very helpful and usually available when needed, whereas another 40% responded "somewhat". Many of the these responses were accompanied by an open-ended response indicating dissatisfaction. Most of these comments reflected an attitude of unwillingness, rudeness, impatience, inaccuracy, and condescension on the part of the staff in their interactions with undergraduates. There were also complaints that reference desks are not always manned with enough personnel to satisfy the demand for assistance at any given time. For Social Science majors this was especially true during evening hours.

MELVYL catalog assistance also received significant criticism from the undergraduates. Of the 31% who are using the MELVYL catalog, one-third are dissatisfied with the quality of service from both the staff and the system itself. Complaints ranged from the assistance being

inadequate, refused or unavailable, to the system being too slow, incomplete, and down too often.

Survey results indicated that there are a number of Library services which many undergraduates are aware of but do not use: i.e., Interlibrary Loan, Government Publications, Arts Reference, Oriental Collections, Black Studies, Chicano Studies, and tours and orientation. Most of these are specialized areas of public service which most undergraduates are not motivated to explore unless their course studies require their use. Low use of Interlibrary Loan service is an indication that the Library's collections are probably adequate for undergraduate needs. Undergraduates are also less likely to order materials through ILL simply because it takes too long to receive the material, (two to three weeks). By the time they get the material it is too late to be of use. Low attendance at tours and orientation signifies a lack of interest in these traditional approaches to increasing awareness of Library services. More innovative techniques are needed to capture the undergraduate interest in such programs.

Other Library services of general interest which exhibit low use and low awareness include Library services that are designed to assist the user in finding information they may not know how to access for themselves, (i.e., computer literature searches, library skills courses, access to items being cataloged, and purchase requests for library materials). A lack of use and awareness in these areas indicates the need for more effective promotional and instructional programs.

Undergraduates seek access to library materials and information through the means that they are most familiar with and that are most direct. In addition, there are differences between the disciplines that affect the relative importance of access methods, although they may not be so pronounced at the undergraduate level. Science disciplines tend to rely more on practical laboratory applications and the most current information found in journals. Social Sciences and Humanities majors rely more on comparative sources of information, including historical and cultural perspectives, statistics and interdisciplinary subjects.

Survey results show that our undergraduates consider the card catalog and serials list to be the most important method of access. To 60% of them it is very important. Of the disciplines, Humanities use the card catalog most, while Sciences tend to use it the least. Consulting Library staff followed as the second most important method to all disciplines; 42% of the undergraduates feel this is very important, while 43% feel it is somewhat important. Standard reference sources (i.e., encyclopedias and dictionaries)

were also important methods, relied on more by Social Science and Humanities majors than by Science majors.

Other methods of access were not as well received. Consulting the MELVYL online catalog brought a variety of responses. One-fourth, especially those in the Science and Social Science disciplines feel it is very important. One-third responded with "somewhat". One-fifth felt it was not at all important, perhaps due to the dissatisfaction and frustration with its limitations and breakdowns. And one-fourth did not know if this method of access to information and resources was important, implying a need for increased education and awareness. Searching online databases both inside and outside the Library met with low interest, although among the disciplines, Sciences were most interested.

Clearly undergraduates are attracted to the traditional or familiar methods of access as well as those that are most direct. Of those surveyed there is more of a reliance on written guides on how to use the Library's resources, personalized assistance from staff, and signs and directories over the more indirect methods of access (i.e., those that require staff intervention such as using computers, including the MELVYL catalog, and using ILL). Even when asked to take a glimpse into the future and explore the wide range of technological possibilities, the undergraduates seem tentative in their enthusiasm, ambiguous in their interest and substantially limited in their knowledge of information technology. Because of these factors, our undergraduate population is difficult to characterize with respect to their advocacy for electronic concepts in library use.

In examining the ways in which undergraduates use the Library, certain needs become clear. Because they come to the Library to study and complete assignments there is an obvious need for both private and group study space. Many respondents felt that the Library is too noisy. Some of them desire a place to buy food and eat. If the Library has become the 'living room away from home' our undergraduates want all the comforts. During peak use periods both space and noise become a problem. Additional study space is provided outside the Library but many feel that it is not enough. Some feel that as undergraduates they should be allowed the use of the private study carrels provided to graduate students. Undergraduates are also interested in having Library hours extended during the peak periods of midterms and final exams to enable them to study a few hours longer. Library security guards have recently been hired to enforce quiet and reduce the amount of food entering the building, but the effectiveness of this method has not yet been evaluated.

In order for undergraduates to complete their assignments they need the tools that will help them process their work. The favorite tools for information processing are typewriters, copy machines, calculators, and for some of the more future-oriented (voiced by both the Sciences and the Social Sciences), word processors and personal computers. Undergraduates are unhappy with the frequent breakdowns and insufficient number of copy machines. Recently, the Library purchased some new machines that operate by credit card, and tend to break down less. But due to the overwhelming use even the newest machines have trouble staying in tune. Undergraduates also want the typing room reinstated. Our undergraduates are looking to their library to supply them with a kind of processing laboratory that will aid them in completing their assignments.

In addition to these physical needs of space and equipment, there are the more complex needs: fundamental skills in being able to use the library resources, increased education, enhanced promotion and a staff that can be relied on to act as the interface between the undergraduate user and the Library.

Undergraduates surveyed feel that they have a pretty good grasp on how to use the Library. They feel comfortable with their understanding of the card catalog, the call number system, their ability to compile bibliographies, and their use of special collections and materials. They are less comfortable with using the MELVYL catalog, finding serials and magazine articles, or reference materials by discipline. They are equipped with the basic, more mechanical aspects of finding information, but seem to have trouble getting from the information source to the actual materials on the shelf. Staff perceptions of undergraduates and their needs did not voice the same confidence. According to staff who have contact with the public, undergraduates are in need of guidance in virtually all aspects of library use.

Undergraduates need to be made aware of the Library's available facilities and resources. They need to be taught basic research skills and strategies. They need to be instructed in the use of basic reference tools in specific disciplines. And they need assistance in the use of the Library's technology and be informed of its applications as well as its limitations.

The need for a comprehensive bibliographic instruction program at this Library cannot be overstated. Nor can the need for a revitalized and more innovative promotion and awareness program. Our comprehensive analysis of the undergraduate population raises significant issues pointing to an erosion of confidence in the effectiveness of present programs. Undergraduates constitute the largest single group of Library users. They have the greatest needs in

terms of space and support services. They place the heaviest burden on reference and informational services. And they are the least sophisticated in their development of library skills and technological aptitude.

The undergraduate constituency challenges this Library to build a public services program of the future which will devote a substantial amount of its time and resources to the development of the undergraduates' library skills and the fullfillment of their educational needs.

GRADUATES

A. User Description

Graduates can be characterized as scholarly readers, both informed and lettered, who generally make intensive use of the Library. They distinguish themselves by their problem-solving approach, by their constant searching, digging up, probing, uncovering, poking into, and persistent inquiry inherent in heuristic learning. Graduates are developing critical thinking skills and their knowledge of research methodologies varies from student to student. While masters degree students concentrate on a fairly circumscribed topic, Ph.D students develop a narrow, but indepth focus. On the average, Ph.D. students tend to stay at UCSB for 4.5 to 8 years and masters degree students less. They are purposeful researchers who view the Library as an integral and significant part of their education and thus the Library is instrumental to their success at UCSB. Of prime concern to this group is access to a large repertoire of both historical and current materials and a dependence on ILL for resources outside of UCSB. Many departments require our graduate students to be proficient in foreign languages and to use materials in languages other than English. During Fall 1985, 17% of the graduate students were from foreign countries.

In Fall 1985, there were 2138 graduates attending UCSB, of which 392 were Humanities graduates, 857 were Social Science graduates, and 889 were Science graduates. Graduate enrollment is steadily climbing (up 130 students or 16% since 1983) and this climb will probably continue over the next 5 to 10 years.

Like the undergraduates, graduate students have chosen fields with high potential for job security. There has been a definite shift away from the Humanities and in part from the Social Sciences toward the Science fields. In 1984/85 the greatest concentration of UCSB graduates were in the fields of Education (376), Electrical and Computer

Engineering (274), Biological Sciences (164), Economics (110), Chemistry (102), and Physics (90). In addition, since 1975 enrollment has increased in Anthropology, Chemical and Nuclear Engineering, Geography, Geology, Mathematics, Mechanical and Environmental Engineering, and Music. Other departments, however, such as Public & Social Affairs, Sociology, Political Science, History, Ergonomics, English, Comparative Literature, and Asian Studies have the highest declining graduate enrollments in the last ten years.

Surveys were sent to a random sampling of 918 (43%) graduate students. Graduates returned 550 questionnaires yielding a 60% response rate. The percent of survey respondents was almost identical to the actual percentages of population by discipline, with a slightly lower percent of Humanities (Appendix II). The high response rate, the high correspondence to the actual population, and the statistical significance of the cross-tabulations furnish reliable testimony for our analysis by status and discipline.

The survey revealed that about one-quarter of our graduates own a microcomputer and three-quarters will own one in the next five years. Moreover, over half of the graduates indicated that they have personal access to a microcomputer--Humanities (55%), Social Sciences (69%), and Sciences (79%). Most of this access is either in the home, lab, office, or microcomputer lab. One-third of the Science graduates indicated access in both the office and lab, but only a very few had access in the home. This differs from the Humanities graduates where access in the home equalled access in the office, and from the Social Science graduates where access is roughly split between home, microcomputer lab, and office.

Amount of personal access to computer terminals is roughly comparable to personal access to microcomputers. For the Humanities graduates most of this access is in the Library (4th floor terminals that are connected to the University's mainframe computers). For the Social Science and Science graduates it is in the office and lab. It is possible that some graduates considered the MELVYL terminals in their response and therefore the intensity of terminal use in the Library is lower than indicated by the responses.

Graduates have considerably less access to modems than to microcomputers or terminals--Humanities (18%), Social Sciences (20%), and Sciences (43%). Although the percentages are negligible for home access for all three disciplines, one-fifth of the Science graduates indicated personal access to a modem in the office and lab. This limited access to a modem indicates that except for a minority of the Science graduates, computer use is largely limited to word processing applications; indeed less than

one-tenth (5%) are currently accessing any commercial computerized information systems outside the Library. This may change as more databases become available online and as online databases replace rather than complement printed versions. There was a great deal of uncertainty surrounding the question of access to a modem; over half of the graduates indicated they didn't know if they had access to a modem. The majority of the graduates are potential users of electronic technology as evidenced by the number that propose to own a microcomputer in the near future, however, it would seem they scarcely realize the full range of applications.

B. Use Patterns

Graduates in all three disciplines do research for theses and dissertations; for local, regional and national graduate lecture series; for published periodical articles; for published or unpublished conference papers; and for faculty to assist them in their work. Three-quarters of the graduates make frequent use of the Library to do research, to look up information for class assignments, and to study for courses using their own materials. Each of these activities is subject-specific rather than general in nature. To a much lesser extent graduates use the Library for general reading (not course-related), for browsing, as a study hall, and to use reserve book materials.

Humanities graduate students seem to make the most intensive use of the Library, although the greater number of Social Science and Science students offset or balance this tendency. Almost all of the Humanities graduates (90%) use the Library frequently for research. Social Science graduates also make heavy use of the Library for research (81%) as compared with only 65% of the Science graduates. It is likely that Science majors carry out much of their research in a lab setting and utilize a limited number of reference works available in their own collection or in the lab. For Social Science disciplines it is likely that the microcomputer lab or the community at large is their research lab. It is assumed that the library is the major laboratory for the Humanities graduate students.

Class assignments take the form of indepth seminar papers (which often become the basis of theses and dissertations), preparation of class assignments connected with teaching assistant positions, and periodic examinations. Nine-tenths of the Humanities graduates use the Library for class assignments, as compared with three-quarters of the Social Science graduates and only half of the Science graduates.

To a lesser degree graduate students use the Library to browse and use the materials placed on course reserve,

activities which support research and the completion of class assignments. Half of the Humanities graduates frequently browse the collections, as compared to nearly half of the Social Science majors, and only a third of the Science majors. Humanities graduates (54%) make the most use of the Reserve Book Room as compared with Social Science graduates (38%) and Science graduates (28%). Unlike the undergraduates, who use the reserve materials most often around exam time, it is likely that our graduate students make regular use of reserve materials throughout the quarter to help write seminar papers. Graduates from all disciplines wanted a longer reserve book loan period. It is assumed that graduates need to study in greater depth the key works on reserve.

C. How Graduate Needs Are Being Met

Graduate students most frequently use those services directly related to their research and the fulfillment of class-related assignments. Circulation is the most highly used service by graduates. In terms of raw numbers, undergraduates check out more books than graduates. In terms of volumes per person, however, graduates check out many more books. In 1984/85, graduates checked out 44.8 volumes per person as compared to 7.9 volumes per undergraduate and 70 volumes per faculty member. Graduates thus compete with faculty for books and journals. We can assume that graduate students make heavy in-house use of non-circulating collections, competing with undergraduates, who outnumber them seven to one, for work space.

Apart from the circulation service, most graduates reported making low or no use of most services--even those services designed to help all patrons regardless of subject interest. In some cases lack of awareness contributes to some low or non-use. The survey revealed that graduates are not fully cognizant of the full range of services and materials that the service points offer. Those services that are "invisible" to the user need better promotion.

Three-quarters of the graduates make low or infrequent use of ILL. Perhaps this reflects a high degree of satisfaction with the available in-house resources, or may reflect constraints on graduate students' time, or dissatisfaction with the inherent delays in ILL. During 1984/85 graduates requested 2521 items in the Social Sciences from ILL, as compared to 1580 items in the Humanities, and 1456 items in the Sciences. Assuming that students borrow materials in their fields of study, Humanities graduates requested 4 items per student, Social Science graduates 3 items per student, and Science graduates 1.6 items per student. Although there is a greater average per student use of ILL by the Humanities, more Social Science items are requested since there are more Social Science graduates. In the

future if the proportion of Humanities graduates increases, there should be an increased demand on ILL.

While graduates feel the card catalog and the MELVYL catalog are important tools, they feel they have attained sufficient skill in using them and prefer not to depend on staff for formal or informal guidance. Over half of the Library personnel, however, feel graduates still need guidance on use of the MELVYL catalog, the availability of reference materials, and in locating bibliographic information. Library staff do not feel that the graduates receive adequate instruction in subject-specific research methodology.

Only a small portion of graduate students use other services such as Arts Library Reference, Government Publications, Special Collections, Music Service Desk, Technical Reports Desk, and Oriental Service with any regularity. An even smaller portion of graduates used the Curriculum Lab, Art Exhibition Collection, Map & Imagery Lab, Chicano Studies Service, Black Studies Service, and Slavic Reference. The subject-specific focus of graduate use and the smaller number of graduates in some fields would account for a part of the low use. Graduates do not appear to view the Library as a totality. And even though they are part of a growing body of interdisciplinary study, they do not explore the full range of possible resources available. Even a library service so specifically aimed at graduate use as thesis advising received low use. A third of the graduates are aware of the service but don't use it, while over half are unaware of the service, for a total of 90% of the responding graduates who don't use it.

Other services that graduates make little or no use of include tours/orientation, assistance using the card catalog, and assistance using the MELVYL catalog, computer literature searching, Special Collections, Government Publications, thesis advising, Interdisciplinary Studies 100, access to items being cataloged, and requests that the Library purchase books or journals. Answers to the open-ended questions have given us significant clues. Unawareness of the services is one factor. Time constraints is another. Graduate students prefer the direct approach to information and expect to make worthwhile, gainful use of their time. They want only pertinent information with direct bearing and application on their research. They do not want to be burdened with general information and they depend little on staff for general library knowledge. Non-use of some services may also be explained by a willingness to be independent and a fear of appearing uninformed. Other times graduates sense there is more to know about the Library or topic of investigation but are often reluctant to interrupt staff.

The graduate students deem most important those methods of access that are most familiar to them, largely traditional tools that can be used without staff assistance and that are related to their main library use--research. As with the undergraduates, consulting the card catalog and the serials list are the most important tools for accessing information although the importance of this varied by discipline. Humanities graduates (95%) and Social Science graduates (86%) felt these two tools were of greater importance than did the Science graduates (73%). Consulting bibliographies was deemed the second most important method by all groups, followed by printed indexes (the choice of both Humanities and Social Science graduates) and one's own books (the choice of the Science graduates).

For the most part, the graduates who use the services connected with these tools are satisfied. The percent of graduates dissatisfied with card catalog assistance, and serials assistance is negligible. Those suggestions for improvement gleaned from the open-ended questions centered on friendlier service, more timely access, and enhancements to the existing services, such as better labeling of index tables and faster binding of journals.

Fewer than half of the graduate students (Humanities-45%, Social Sciences-21%, Sciences-11%) found reference books to be very useful. For the Science graduates this might be explained by the availability of primary reference tools in the lab and the Science graduates' interpretation of what constitutes a reference tool. We can assume that Science graduates are buying their own texts and reference tools to conduct lab experiments and to carry out other class assignments. For the Social Science and Humanities graduates this can perhaps be explained by the dispersed arrangement of the reference collection in the stacks, which makes both awareness of new tools and access to tools more difficult. Graduates in all disciplines might use reference tools more if they knew about their existence and usefulness and if the tools were located in a designated reference area.

Browsing traditionally accompanies indepth research in a narrow field. Browsing, however, is low for all graduates. The collections are very large now and graduates are taking an interdisciplinary approach to their topics. "Their" materials can no longer be found on a few ranges in the stacks, but are now dispersed over eight floors and two buildings.

Graduates responded with uncertainty to both the MELVYL catalog and computer literature searching. Graduates consider computers an indirect method of access that takes substantial training and staff intervention. While some requested MELVYL terminals on all floors, only one-third

felt the MELVYL catalog very important. Students do not want to consult two catalogs to access the Library's holdings. A dissatisfaction with the MELVYL catalog, due to incompleteness and slowness, clearly overrides an otherwise open receptivity and hopeful attitude towards computer-based information systems as indicated in the open-ended responses. Science graduates in particular noted a dissatisfaction with what they perceive to be inefficient search strategy. The MELVYL catalog ranks lowest with Humanities graduates, who deem consulting their own books, consulting Library staff, and browsing more important than using the MELVYL catalog. We can assume our graduates do not find the MELVYL catalog as adequate a tool as the card catalog. On the other hand, we cannot assume that all our graduates have invested the time and energy to understand the techniques and capabilities of the MELVYL catalog. It is likely that an increase in appreciation for the MELVYL catalog will accompany an increase in skill.

Most graduate students see the Library as an integral part of their education. They tend to take a critical view of Library services in that they 1) hold a high expectation for staff knowledge of specific subjects, 2) prefer the direct approach to information and timely access to information is essential and 3) need to synthesize a wide-ranging body of current and historical information, some of which will not be readily available in-house. To assist them through the labyrinth of information, staff must know which means of access are expedient and which are circuitous, which resources are of value, and which are not. Furthermore, staff must communicate these differences in a clear and convincing fashion.

Although the survey did not ask the user to rate the quality of the collection, evidence in the open-ended questions indicates that to a large extent the Library appears to be meeting most collection needs. Some users, however, noted a need for more materials, both books and journals, especially in the Social Sciences and Sciences. Science graduates indicated a need for multiple copies of texts used in courses. Graduates also wanted faster re-shelving of journals, quicker turn-around time at the bindery, and prompt service in ordering and processing materials. A few graduates did not want remote storage to be implemented. Graduates are still book-oriented and a strong collection remains their first need. As such, preservation of library materials will become increasingly important to graduates in the future.

Graduates make and demand more sophisticated use of the library staff than do undergraduates. The majority of users indicated a satisfaction with the various reference service desks. Some, however, indicated distrust regarding some Library personnel. Some graduates were critical of the

unfriendliness of staff at various service points, and questioned the quality of subject-specific reference. Many felt that student workers gave inaccurate information. Certainly many graduates are sophisticated users and are easily frustrated when access to information is barred by a communication breakdown of machines or with humans. A large minority of graduates view the unavailability of staff as a problem. They feel staff are not present or are too busy helping other patrons. Graduates also called for extended reference service hours during evenings and weekends, and consultant desks in the stacks. Graduates tend to view the Library reference personnel as personal consultants when user needs and problems rise, and as people who can provide assistance with electronic technology (at least with the MELVYL catalog). When they come to the Library, they expect to find prompt, courteous, and relevant assistance.

When asked whether further guidance in the use of the Library's resources would be helpful, a majority (67%) said yes. Those who responded affirmatively were particularly interested in the availability of reference materials in a specific discipline, followed by how to use the MELVYL catalog and how to find articles in magazines and journals. Graduates do not want more information of a general nature on the UCSB Library, nor information on how to use the card catalog or the call number system. There was a strong indication in the open-ended questions that they are interested in subject-specific tours designed for graduates, orientation meetings to meet librarians responsible for their subject area, and bibliographic courses related to their area of study. We can assume that bibliographic sophistication makes a difference to graduates in the educational process. We need to find ways to capture the imaginations of the graduates regarding library instruction to enable them to gain this sophistication.

Graduates indicated that direct approaches requiring little investment of personal time were most important to increase their awareness of or their ability to use the Library. As such, graduates prefer to have librarians working with them individually on research projects, written guides on how to use the Library's resources and services, and improved signs and directories. They seemed dubious about the value of computer-assisted library instruction which they view as time-consuming to learn.

Graduates asked for quiet and private study space. While this is particularly important to those who spend a great deal of time with non-circulating collections such as those in Arts and in Special Collections, graduates in all disciplines, particularly the Sciences, requested more study space free from the party atmosphere of the undergraduates.

Many graduates asked that the Library stay open longer hours, especially in Reference and ILL. Graduates tend to work in the Library for long stretches of time and at odd hours possibly due to their relatively short stay at UCSB and to commitments of part-time employment. As more user-friendly and cheaper online database systems such as BRS After Dark become available, there may be more late-night requests for online searching. On the other hand, remote access to these services could relieve the pressure for longer hours.

Graduates want improvements to the present technologies. They want a more comprehensive, faster, and user-friendly online catalog, improved microform machines and printers, more accessible and cheaper commercial database services, and more and better copy machines. Copy machines are used frequently by the Science graduates who make heavy use of journal items. Graduates also make heavy use of copy machines in connection with reserve materials and other non-circulating collections. Graduates expressed a need for copy machine maintenance on weekends. Printers and copy machines are natural extensions of the online or printed word and become tools which not only save time but allow a decentralization of learning and research.

Roughly only one quarter of our graduates have ever used the computer literature search service, and many of these are Science majors. This represents a decline over five years, although graduate use of this service is still greater than faculty or undergraduate use (Appendix IV). Discouragements to the use of this service might include too great a cost, insufficient results, complex search set-up, and the need for appointments. Many are simply unaware of the service. Even fewer graduates conduct computer literature searching outside the Library. Most graduates who do are in the Sciences.

Among those who do use the computer literature search service, there is a small rate (20%) of dissatisfaction. Some graduates want to perform their own searches unaided by librarians or to access commercial databases from home or office. They also want end-user instruction, "hands-on" demonstrations on subject-specific search strategies, and a course on computer searching. They want to be better informed about the computer literature search service, have less costly computer searching available, and have more capable librarians performing the searches. There seems to be a lack of understanding of the capabilities of online searching, which may contribute to the feeling that the system (or the librarians) are giving too little return for their money. It is important to note that graduates often rely on the faculty for information regarding their research. Educating faculty on the pros and cons of online

searching should help make the graduates more aware of the limits and value of online searching.

The top four priorities for the future for our graduates are 1) access to the circulation system from within the Library, 2) direct access to database searching within the Library, 3) 24-hour computer reference, and 4) remote access to an online catalog. All of these reduce the need for direct staff assistance. Other "future" technologies users asked for include printers to the MELVYL catalog, books on laser disk subject to text searching, expansion of the 4th floor terminal room, journal citations on the MELVYL catalog, remote access to current journal tables of contents, online serials holdings, library computer accounts for online searching, access to personal computers for word processing, and enhancements to copy machines (i.e., enlarging and use of magnetic cards), and typewriters.

These suggestions certainly indicate a growing desire to have independent, increased, and more convenient access to bibliographic information, both inside and outside the Library. They want more sophisticated access to the familiar and are less interested in the unknown. They want individualized instruction on resources in their area and on how to use them. They desire to be aware but they don't want to go out of their way to explore the Library on their own. Many graduate students seem to have only a vague intuition of the potentials of the future. Perhaps they are too busy living the present.

FACULTY

A. User Description

As a research university, UCSB is striving to attain greater national and international stature. The campus administration is establishing strong academic departments and increasing the level of research funding by attracting outstanding faculty.

In the Fall of 1985, there were 811 FTE faculty positions--43% in the Humanities, 29% in the Social Sciences, and 28% in the Sciences.

The number of faculty, and the degree and pace of faculty activity and research will continue to increase as enrollment increases. Increased funding by the State of California is reversing the constraints of previous budget retrenchment. Extramural funding for research has increased three-fold over the past five years. The Chancellor is committed to making UCSB a truly distinguished research university and has launched a multi-million dollar campaign towards this goal.

Surveys were sent to 819 faculty members; 47% (388) responded. There was virtually an even distribution of responses from faculty in all disciplines. Considering the excellent return rate of surveys and the confidence level of .05, the findings can be considered to be reliable enough to generalize to the broader faculty population.

The survey showed that half the faculty already own their own microcomputer with another quarter planning to acquire one within the next five years. Indeed, the presence of microcomputers on campus is at an all time high. In June, 1984, there were 216 IBM PC's in academic departments. By January, 1986, there were 527 IBMs, an increase of 144%. There are also over 300 Macintoshes on campus, mostly for personal use.

About one-fourth of the faculty have personal access to microcomputers through their offices or laboratories, or other locations. One-third had access to terminals (wired to mainframes or attached to modems), again through their offices or laboratories. One-fourth of the faculty reported that they had no access to terminals. One-third of the faculty reported that they had access to a modem either at their office or laboratory or at their home. Another third reported that they had no access to a modem.

Personal access and use of microcomputers is significant for faculty. One can expect that the intensity and sophistication of the use of this technology will grow as the ranks of faculty grow, as new faculty share computer experience, as the level of campus research expands, and as research funding continues to increase significantly as it has done over the last five years.

B. Use Patterns

The faculty use the Library primarily to obtain information for research and to prepare for classes. Three-quarters of the faculty frequently use the Library to obtain information for research. Half of the faculty frequently use the Library to prepare for classes. Faculty feel the pressure to prepare for classes on a day-to-day basis, although their research activities, even more than their teaching, affect their livelihood. Thus, they take a serious view toward the University and the Library and are probably the busiest of our three groups.

Less than half use the Library frequently to contact a librarian for collection development purposes, although this activity distinguishes this group from the students. Unlike the students, the faculty have a long-term investment in the

University and many look to the Library for future as well as current usefulness.

On the whole, faculty research needs are generally highly specialized; they are interested mainly in their own field of research. Occasionally they jump topics within disciplines and now there is a trend toward increased interdisciplinary research among all disciplines. Each discipline tends to employ only a few selected services from the variety the Library offers, however, we can expect faculty library use patterns to reflect the changes taking place in scholarly research. These changes of topic and discipline will also demand additional resources to support new faculty interests. At the same time, faculty may participate in collection development for more than one discipline.

C. How Faculty Needs Are Being Met

Like the graduates, faculty utilize the circulation service more frequently than other Library services. Faculty check out more books per person than the students and, like the graduates, they have a need for a broad range of materials, both historical and current, both in and out-of-print, both circulating and non-circulating, and in a variety of languages and formats. Faculty demand for efficient circulation services is expected to continue into the future and document delivery is becoming an increasingly important method of access to them. Some faculty do not care to visit the Library in order to check out books. Instead, they rely on student proxies to do the footwork. Others have started to take advantage of the newly instigated document delivery service at the Library. Only a handful of faculty are currently taking advantage of this new service; it is too soon to tell to what degree this service will be utilized.

Outside of the circulation service, most faculty make little or no use of other Library services. These services include Reference/Information Desk, ILL, Reserve Book Service, Serials Desk Assistance, requests for library purchase of books and journals, Government Publications, Art Exhibition Catalog Reference, Music Service Desk and listening facilities, Map and Imagery Lab, ethnic library units, card catalog assistance, assistance with the MELVYL catalog, tours and orientation, and computer literature searching. While some of these areas are applicable only to a limited number of faculty, others are of use to a wider range.

In the survey, faculty indicated a great affinity to the traditional access systems with which they are most familiar. All three groups shared this similarity. An overwhelming majority (88%) considered the card catalog to be very important to access information. This is not

unexpected nor does it preclude the value of a local online catalog. Presently the card catalog is the most complete record of UCSB cataloged holdings; it is virtually always available. Faculty are often under pressure to get their hands on a library item for a class lecture. Frustration sets in when this is not possible, especially when they know the Library owns an item, but it is not listed in the card catalog. Faculty time is valuable; this group is looking for a mode of access that is always available, contains a listing of all holdings, and is easy to use.

A large majority (70%) responded that consulting their own books and journals was an important source of information. Again, having information nearby and easily accessible is a top priority for our faculty. Like the students who depend on their own books, faculty prefer the familiar and the direct.

A large majority (68%) considered bibliographies or references in books and journals a very important source of information. This again reflects the importance of information that is readily available. The bibliography at the end of a journal article that a faculty member is reading is right at hand; s/he need spend no time searching for it. Printed indexes and abstracts on the other hand were very important to fewer, albeit to nearly half (47%) of the faculty (particularly to those in the Social Sciences). These are familiar and comfortable tools, but can be very time-consuming ones.

Only a third of the faculty considered browsing the collections to be important. It was most important to the Humanities faculty, and least important to the Science disciplines. Because of the comparative nature of their research, Humanities faculty tend to use a broader range of materials. Where browsing was once easy in a smaller collection and in a single discipline, it now tends to be more difficult and requires more faculty time. It is also difficult to use a proxy for browsing.

While half of the faculty stated that Interlibrary Loan was a very important way to access information, an overwhelming majority of 82% make low or no use of ILL services. This may indicate that their information needs are being satisfied by available resources. By continually building the collection in anticipation of their future needs (and for posterity), faculty reduce their dependence on ILL and thus the delay in accessing information.

Only a third of the faculty felt that consulting reference books was very important. This varied dramatically by discipline, from over half of the Humanities faculty deeming it important compared to about a sixth of the Sciences faculty deeming it important. Sciences faculty seem to rely

on their own reference books, or the reference collections in their labs. The need for reference materials is likely to increase as faculty research becomes more interdisciplinary. They will have to be educated to use tools in the other disciplines.

Of those who use the Reference/Information Desk, almost all are satisfied. However, a large majority (66%) make low or no use of this service. Faculty tend to work independently from Library staff on their research or else rely on graduate assistance. Only a small minority (16%) indicated frequent use of the Reference/Information Desk. Many Sciences faculty depend on word-of-mouth for current information and do not dig through dusty tomes to find what they need. Low use of Reference/Information may also reflect the faculty preference for enhanced modes of information delivery systems. They seem to prefer to come to the Library as little as possible. Even though some faculty indicated longer hours as a Library improvement, we can assume they do not need staff during this time, but direct access to materials for class presentations and research.

Overall, a majority (69%) did not depend on staff at any service point for access to information. In particular an overwhelming majority of the Sciences faculty (71%) indicated that consulting staff was either not at all or somewhat important to them. At the other end of the spectrum a very large minority of Humanities faculty (39%) felt it was very important.

At the same time, those who do use the staff indicated an overall satisfaction with staff helpfulness. In fact, a large majority (70%) said they were very helpful. An equally large majority said that staff were usually available when needed while a small number (14%) indicated that they were sometimes available. While most faculty found staff to be very helpful, the remaining 20% who were less than very satisfied with the quality of staff assistance is too large a group to discount. Comments in the staff survey also reflected this need. Attitudinal problems need to be corrected, subject specialty competency needs to be improved, including skill in conducting cost-effective computer searches.

The staff survey revealed a faculty need for library instruction. This was recognized by the staff who work most closely with the public. To them, it is not only undergraduates who need help, but the graduates and faculty as well. Faculty response, however, indicated a general ambivalence about the need for further guidance. Over one-third expressed a desire for more help, while the majority (58%) said no or indicated they didn't know. Of those who wanted help, one-fourth wanted to know how to use the MELVYL

online catalog, while one-fourth wanted guidance on the availability of reference materials in their discipline. Only a negligible number of faculty indicated that they desired assistance with finding serials, and on the use of special collections or materials. For the most part our faculty feel they are fairly sophisticated library users. It would seem that they have not had the time to keep up with technological advancements in the Library or the latest reference tools in their fields. Further, while faculty believe they are aware of Library services, perhaps they are not fully cognizant of the content and value of the services to effectively exploit them.

The faculty were asked to respond to the effectiveness of ways to increase their students' awareness of and ability to use the Library. They indicated no strong opinion on how this could best be accomplished, but the top choices were: 1) librarians working individually with students, 2) written guides, and 3) librarians giving course-related lectures in the Library. Faculty strongly opposed librarians giving course-related lectures in their classroom. Faculty are not willing to share their teaching time with librarians. This may be due in part to the length of the academic quarter and the need to cover broad areas of information in a short period of time. Only half of the faculty provide some sort of instruction to their classes on indexes and other reference materials in their fields, and only one-sixth do this with any frequency. The other half may not feel it necessary or may depend on the Library to assist the student at the time of need. The faculty, through the expectations they place on students and the assignments they make to them, are probably the single most important influence on the way students use the Library. By improving the service to faculty, by increasing their awareness of Library services, we will ultimately have an impact on how students use the Library.

The faculty also indicated no strong opinion on how best to increase their own awareness of and ability to use Library services. The faculty expressed a marginal interest in faculty seminars and only a quarter indicated that librarians working individually with them on research projects was considered very important. The staff had a different opinion. They felt librarians providing reference and collection development service to faculty would be the most effective method, followed by seminars to keep faculty informed about new Library resources. The general sense among staff is that faculty are only somewhat aware of what is available.

A few conclusions may be extrapolated from this data. First, the highly specialized nature of faculty research needs may lead them to rely on a narrow range of information resources with which they are familiar and thus lead them to

feel sufficiently aware and able to meet their own research needs without outside assistance. This may change as the approach to scholarly research becomes more interdisciplinary. Second, it is noted that among the open-ended comments a remote access online catalog and a document delivery system were most often cited as being effective methods to increase their awareness. This indicates that there is a small growing segment of faculty who are becoming computer literate and are aware of the benefits of information technology, particularly in view of the demands on their time.

The vast majority of faculty indicated that they expected technology to make little or no change in their research needs over the next 5-10 years, although some anticipated remote access with document delivery and more computer searches through the use of personal computers. An overwhelming number of the faculty (84%) are not making use of computerized information systems. Only a negligible percentage of faculty (9%) were using such systems. The faculty have little access and make low use of modems; this correlates to their very low use of commercial databases which can be accessed only through modems. As faculty become aware of what their colleagues at other institutions are doing with microcomputers, this attitude may change. At the University of Wisconsin, for example, as of 1986 over 5000 microcomputers have been distributed to academic departments. This number is expected to increase dramatically in the near future. Faculty in all disciplines are venturing into new aspects of research and class instruction through the use of microcomputers. As dynamic new faculty from other institutions are attracted to UCSB, they will bring with them experience with new technologies and an expectation to continue to use these technologies.

Our faculty in general do not consider searching online databases inside the Library an important need. In fact, over three-quarters indicated that this service was either somewhat, not at all, or of unknown importance. While only 19% of all faculty were unaware of this service, in-house statistics showed a substantial drop in paid online searches for faculty (down 51% since 1982, Appendix IV). This may signal a need for the Library to seek more effective ways to promote this service and insure that there is an adequate supply of trained searchers to provide expeditious service.

Among the group that does use the computer databases, most relied on the Library to make the connection, while a smaller number indicated that they accessed the databases from either home or office/lab. Overall, a small minority (20%) considered searching from outside the Library to be very important. The Sciences faculty expressed the greatest interest; the lowest interest lies with the Humanities faculty. In fact, no matter where the access, computer

searching is most important to those in the Sciences, who need to keep abreast of the most current research, followed by those in the Social Sciences. These findings reflect the greater number of databases available in the Sciences than in the other disciplines.

Reviewing the literature in any field has never been easy, and it is bound to become even more complicated with the rapid growth of information and the increasingly interdisciplinary nature of research. Faculty may rely on the Library to provide more selective dissemination of information services (i.e., SDI) in the future.

What the faculty perceive as current problems and future needs varies by discipline, although all disciplines expressed dissatisfaction with the MELVYL catalog and the need for remote access to the Library's holdings. Only one quarter indicated that the MELVYL catalog was very important to them. The faculty expressed dissatisfaction with the slow response time and the incomplete database. Like the students, the faculty may need more awareness of the limitations of the MELVYL catalog and more guidance on how to use the system effectively. Other complaints by the faculty centered on better photocopy machines, the slowness of ILL, acquisitions and cataloging of materials, and the Reserve Book Service.

In many ways, the faculty see Library procedures as being too complicated and as taking too much of their time. They are alienated from the librarians in terms of library instruction and seem to make the closest contacts in terms of developing the collection. They will probably take advantage of remote access to the online catalog because it offers them an opportunity to save time by not coming into the Library. The Library will face a greater challenge to respond to their particular needs in the years ahead.

CONCLUSIONS TO THE FINDINGS

The profile of our primary constituency is a study in complexity and change: with one hand on a book, one eye on a computer screen, one foot in the present and one foot in the future. In most cases we are meeting today's needs adequately. With rapid changes taking place in the academic and library environments, however, we cannot remain static or assume present procedures will meet future needs. It is critical that the Library respond to the changing and varied information needs of each very different part of its constituency and alter its own profile to meet their needs in the future.

Our findings point out that we need to strengthen the relationship between the user and the Library. New relationships involving user education and awareness need to be established. It is not only an issue of improving and bettering a relationship, but of relating in a new way--a proactive way. Our current passive role of acquiring, organizing, and storing information does not create an active relationship with the constituency. Relationships have not been established that promote a leadership role for the Library, and an image of a competent, skilled and innovative staff. If the Library is going to be a viable force on the campus in the future, it must pay attention to establishing ties with the constituency and building an atmosphere of trust and mutual respect.

Our findings cluster around two points of concern: 1) user education and orientation, and 2) user awareness of services and resources. A majority of students as well as a large minority of faculty want more guidance in the Library's resources and services. The users have a low awareness level of many Library services, even those that are not subject-specific. Our constituency has called for more promotion, more specific instruction, and more direct and relevant approaches to information access. We need to expand our information role into an education role.

It is evident from the survey findings that the present staffing configuration will not be adequate to meet future needs. Staff must become active educators. Increased enrollment will bring increased staffing; however, it should be very carefully deployed. The reference service desks will be hit hard by an overwhelming number of unsophisticated library users. As the Library becomes more crowded, there will be a greater need to build user self-service and self-sufficiency. Many users demand and depend on our staff to judiciously refer them to relevant resources and provide expert consultation. Others are either unaware of the assistance that staff can give them or have little confidence in that assistance. An insufficient quality of service in this regard has and will continue to contribute to low use and possibly an erosion of services.

Although technology becomes more and more a part of the academic and library setting, the need for qualified staff has not diminished. Instead, technology has made users more dependent on staff for up-to-date knowledge of technological enhancements and resources, and for their ability to provide clear and succinct instruction and documentation on the use of technology. Technology demands that staff be able to determine not only that information exists, but what route is appropriate to reach that information. It is clear that the way staff will be trained and utilized in the future will have a major impact on the success of new user services and the users' image of the Library.

Our findings also reveal dissatisfaction with current Library technology and equipment. Frequent users are not necessarily successful in using the MELVYL catalog. Many complaints about the MELVYL system indicate more instruction and guidance is needed and desired. Our constituency will not acquiesce to problems with technology, but have started to make real demands on library automation, such as having an online catalog that is complete, fast and flexible in terms of search strategy. The constituency is also making demands in terms of future enhancements to current library technology, including remote access to a UCSB online catalog, access to circulation records to see if a book is checked out or on the shelf, printers attached to the online catalog, and end-user commercial database searching. Traditional equipment such as copy machines and typewriters continue to be high priorities for our constituency as important methods of processing the information they acquire in the Library. The need to continually upgrade existing and developing technologies and equipment is a pressing one.

Adequate space for study and the use of non-circulating collections continues to be a priority for our students. Competition between students for a variety of uses of space is high. It is expected that demands for space will continue despite the new building now being planned and will become more critical as enrollment rises. At the same time, the demand for alternative study space outside the Library, such as in the UCEN and in University classrooms will continue. The ability of the campus administration to provide this space will have a major impact on the Library environment.

Thus, the results of the findings reveal that while many respondents are satisfied with the Library, others acknowledge their need for more guidance and many are unaware of the resources and services. Staff at times are unable to meet their needs, and both technology and space are concerns now and in the future. The optimal scenario that follows identifies our future user, his/her future use patterns and needs, and recommendations for meeting those needs.

OPTIMAL SCENARIO

I. INTRODUCTION

We have examined our present constituency, its changing environment, library use patterns and needs. We now cast an eye to the future to try to discern ways the Library can remain a vital component of campus life. As the University

moves toward excellence and as enrollment rises, the Library must parallel this with growth in quality of services, staff, and resources. Moreover, user benefits derived from Library services in the future will be in direct proportion to the quality of efforts devoted to planning and implementing those services.

This section begins the planning process necessary to build quality in the Library programs of the future. It contains a list of underlying assumptions for the future, and a description of our future constituency, its changing environment, use patterns and needs. A list of recommendations sums up our optimal scenario.

II. ASSUMPTIONS ABOUT THE FUTURE

The following are assumptions about the future that might affect user needs, Library services, and their promotion. We continually held these factors in view when describing our constituency of the future, and in determining their needs:

1. There is a continuing trend away from education for an agricultural or industrial-based society toward education for an information-based society reliant on computers, automation, data processing and the speedy dissemination of information. Industry and business will encourage universities to produce engineers, computer scientists, technicians, and business
   - administrators.

2. UCSB officials predict that enrollment will reach 22,000 by the year 2000. The increase will occur among graduates as well as undergraduates. The proportion of ethnic groups and other affirmative action constituents will probably increase at both levels. The increased crowding on and off campus will make greater demands on Library space, materials, equipment, and staff. There will probably be a greater proportion of part-time students.

3. UCSB entrance requirements will be more stringent; students will require less remedial education.

4. There will be an increase in the number of faculty parallel to the increase in enrollment.

5. Faculty research will cross disciplinary lines between the Sciences, Social Sciences, and Humanities to a greater degree than currently occurs.

6. Microcomputers will be accessible to faculty and students in all academic departments.

7. The new technology will not save time for the faculty; they will have to make the most effective use possible of their time.

8. Computer technology will continue to create new approaches to scholarly research.

9. Changes in scholarship will stress new interrelations of materials which will require new access modes and new cooperative ventures between librarians and faculty.

10. The faculty will continue to have some skepticism about librarians' ability to meet their information needs.

11. Computers will have an increased impact on research in the Humanities and the Social Sciences and will create a greater demand for numerical and textual data bases.

12. There will be a greater diversification of library technology, such as stand-alone information systems, more user-friendly personal computer access systems to online databases, remote access systems, laser disk systems, and integrated library information systems.

13. Changing technology will make it easier to store, retrieve, and reproduce visual materials such as art works, slides, and photographs in all fields. In addition a merging of communication technologies will result in new information products and services.

14. There will be an increase in the number of available online data bases, some of which will replace printed indexes. The output of printed indexes, however, will be undiminished.

15. The card catalog will be completely converted to machine readable form in 5-10 years.

16. The library's investment in bibliographic instruction will be rewarded by an increased level of sophistication and self-sufficiency which the library user will maintain throughout life.

17. The staff will need to be constantly trained in the changing technologies.

18. The library will have to be flexible to meet changing user needs as information delivery systems evolve.

III. DESCRIPTION OF LIBRARY USER OF THE FUTURE

A. Environment

UCSB library users of the future, whether undergraduate, graduate, or faculty, will find themselves in an environment that demands literacy, flexibility and a sensitivity or responsiveness to change. Education continues to reinforce the shift away from an agricultural or industrial-based society towards one based on information. The University will remain the cultivator of knowledge and expertise in the fields which will support this new society.

Enrollment at the University is expected to climb towards 22,000 by the year 2000. Both undergraduate and graduate student populations will increase, with the proportion of ethnic and other affirmative action constituents growing accordingly. This growth in the student population will necessitate a subsequent increase in the number of faculty, and the number of Library staff.

The campus community will become crowded in its attempts to accomodate this increase. The Library will feel the crunch of greater demands on its space, materials, equipment, and staffing.

According to the enrollment trends recorded over the past seven years, we may expect to see sustained growth in the fields of Education, Engineering, Biological Sciences, Economics, Chemistry, Physics, the Geosciences, and Mathematics, while disciplines in the Humanities are likely to diminish. Financial security is expected to remain the primary motivator in the educational program of these students.

As UCSB reaches its goal of academic maturity it continues to evolve as a broad-based research institution, strengthening its academic departments with funding and distinguished faculty. Funding for research will correspondingly result in scholarly productivity, and in turn, enrich instruction.

Research funding in the last five years has grown by 11 million dollars. We can expect funding to continue its rise. Engineering and Science are the current leaders of both research funding and activity. Those departments with the largest research budgets include Biological Sciences, Chemistry, Physics, Chemical and Nuclear Engineering, and Electrical and Computer Engineering. The University also maintains organized research units with the Institute of Theoretical Physics, Marine Science Institute, Quantum Institute, and the new Center for Robotics Systems in Microelectronics leading in terms of funding dollars.

If these are the blocks on which the foundation of UCSB's future as a major research university is being built, we can be confident that these will continue to receive primary focus and consideration of the University.

Many areas of study will become increasingly dependent on a wide variety of information sources that cross over into different disciplines. This will have a great importance to graduate students and faculty who are involved in the research arena. But to a lesser degree, the undergraduate program will continue to emphasize the importance of a well-rounded education.

The Library must be able to support this growing emphasis on research, recognize the importance of interrelations between the disciplines and provide the informational tools, materials and services necessary to all of its future constituents, from the undergraduate freshman to the most eminent faculty. In order for the Library to meet these expectations, it must keep pace with the changes taking place around it.

B. Technology and the Library

The Library will be faced with a larger population of users, more materials, less space for both study and storage of materials, budget constraints, and a more sophisticated constituency. A storage facility will relieve some of the overcrowding in the stacks. We are likely to see an increase in resource sharing within the UC System, with other information resources outside the system, and through affiliations with private and governmental organizations both at a national and international level.

The Library must turn to the technologies of computers to be able to access these resources from locations outside the Library. This will cause a shift away from direct access towards indirect access because of system complexity. While it will result in a less immediate retrieval and transfer of information, it will provide a wider range of information resources to tap into and a method to select precisely what one wants from that range.

The future will also see greater developments in instructional uses of the microcomputer. Computers will offer simulated learning environments allowing greater flexibility and cost effectiveness for the teaching process.

Limited space will also result in more information being stored on microfilm, computer disk or tapes, and optical disk formats. There will be a growing need for the Library to be able to archivally store raw data, in textual, numeric

and pictorial formats, in these new capacities. Browsing through the collections or turning the pages of a book is an active method of accessing and digesting information. We are likely to see a more passive method take place as more of the informational resources will be stored in these formats. Touching a computer screen may become the page turning of the future.

C. Constituency Groups in the Future

Each constituent will bring a different set of informational needs and level of library experience.

1. UNDERGRADUATES

Undergraduates will enter the University better prepared for the demands of higher education. Less of their time will be spent relearning the basics of math, English and science. We can expect them to be a more select group having passed through more stringent entrance requirements. While they will increasingly possess greater basic academic skills, they will not bring with them better library skills. They will, however, be more capable of responding to a more research-oriented academic program. Moreover, this increased aptitude for learning will enable them to become more adept at acquiring library skills.

They will have a better understanding of computers and their capabilities. As more information is stored, processed and transferred via computer in their daily lives, their exposure to these technological applications will increase. Computers will be used increasingly as instructional tools, simulating laboratory applications and other learning environments of the physical world. Hands-on computer experience in grade school and high school will have prepared many of them for the encounters awaiting them in their University library. Over half of the undergraduate population will own a microcomputer. The low rates of computer literacy that were revealed in our survey are bound to rise. Any increase in awareness will result in greater use and greater sophistication of use. For undergraduates, the current trend of using computers primarily for word processing may continue, but they nonetheless will be exposed to an expanded potential of computer applications. We can expect this encounter to be the beginning of a developing and multifaceted learning process, full of rewards for the curious.

The design of the undergraduate academic program is not likely to change significantly in that they will still be oriented towards short-term research projects and assignments. Undergraduates will continue to look to the

Library as an information processing center, a study hall and an information access center, and their demands for service in all of these areas will increase. They will remain attracted to methods of access which combine familiarity with efficiency (i.e., reference/information, circulation system, catalog system, both traditional and online). They will seek study space which is both comfortable and quiet. They will expect the Library to provide the necessary processing equipment (i.e., copy machines, printers, word processors) for their academic work.

2. GRADUATES

Graduate students will continue to be research-oriented within the narrow scope of their subject fields. At the same time, their specific field of study may be more dependent on a variety of disciplinary informational sources. They will continue to compete with undergraduates for space and basic materials within the Library, and with faculty for materials oriented towards their research needs.

We can expect more graduates to have access to computers in their academic departments or in the home. While space and materials within the Library become more scarce due to crowding, we can expect graduates to make greater use of available remote access tools to the Library's resources.

Graduates distinguish themselves from undergraduates by being more intent on their research. We can expect them to become more exploratory in their research methodologies and more responsive to the evolving technologies of computers, as a result of enhanced awareness of computer applications. As they utilize computers for research and instructional purposes, they will develop greater independence as library users.

Graduates will work increasingly with faculty assisting them with research and designing instructional programs that may utilize the computer as a teaching instrument. Additionally, graduates will make use of the computer as an instructional tool in writing their theses and dissertations, with programs such as indexing and management of bibliographic references, designed according to standardized style books.

While their independence as library users is likely to increase, they will look to the librarian for instruction and guidance in the everchanging capabilities of the computer as a tool for information access and to assist them with more complex research.

As book budgets decrease and resource sharing increases, they will depend more on ILL. Graduates will remain attracted to methods of access that are familiar and useful, but these methods will be more sophisticated than today's methods.

3. FACULTY

Faculty will remain the primary researchers of the University, but within an academic environment that promotes and supports their research in highly specialized subject fields. They will continue to seek out new information, sharing knowledge with their research peers, through word of mouth and a familiarity with those at the forefront of their field. These are their sources for keeping pace with the latest innovations and information. They will look to the Library as a source of citations and publications, and as a center for access to other resource avenues.

Faculty will continue to compete with graduate students for research materials and personalized assistance from staff. But they will continue to delegate much of their research footwork to graduate students. Economy of research time will remain a high priority and increase the demand for remote access to information.

Increases in tenure track faculty will consequently result in an increase in research to qualify for tenured professorship, as the system rewards and encourages publication.

Microcomputers will be available in all academic departments. Computer literacy among faculty is expected to increase as they become more familiar with technological applications to research and as the role of interdisciplinary research expands. They will, however, continue to rely on the traditional scholars' network of sharing information between colleagues, either through conferences, colloquiums, individual correspondence, or research centers on campus, for most of their information needs.

Faculty will continue to improve their research and teaching skills as their familiarity with the technology increases and as more information including raw data is stored on disk. They will look to the Library as an archival storage facility for this new raw data, and to librarians for instruction and guidance in accessing this and other resources.

D. Use Patterns in the Future

1. With an increase in the number of undergraduates doing research, there will be more competition to use reserve and stack materials. There will be greater use of the collections over each quarter, and possibly there will be more protracted use of reserves throughout the quarter.

2. Some users will utilize reference via computer, both within the Library and through remote access.

3. There will be an increase in end-user searching of commercial and library databases, both in the Library and through remote access.

4. There will be less dependence on consulting the card catalog and other manual access tools.

5. As the Library becomes more crowded, users will continue to seek alternative places for study.

6. As users become more research-oriented, the demand for reference will be more sophisticated and more evenly distributed throughout the quarter.

7. Undergraduates and graduate students will seek more assistance in using the Library's resources as the Library becomes more complex.

8. Due to the increase in interdisciplinary research, there will be a subsequent increase in the use of reference services to gain access to information outside of a primary discipline.

9. Some users will make more use of ILL as a result of improved bibliographic access, including more readily available citation information through online database searching.

10. There will be an increase in the use of the Library's document delivery service, particularly as remote access to the online catalog becomes available.

11. Upper division and graduate students will make increased use of discipline-related library instruction.

12. Faculty will make greater use of discipline-related awareness programs.

13. Faculty and graduate students will increasingly turn to the Library as a source for storage and retrieval of non-bibliographic (textural & numeric) data files.

14. Many faculty will utilize electronic mail for communicating with the Library and with library subject specialists.

E. Basic Needs in the Future

1. Instruction

a. Users will continue to need a solid foundation of basic library skills and point-of-need advanced research skills.

b. Users will need to be conversant with library technology, and have a sound understanding of both its capabilities and its limitations.

2. Awareness/Orientation

a. Users will need a broad knowledge of what the Library has to offer them in terms of the complete spectrum of services, resources and instructional programs available.

b. Users will need to be able to orient themselves as quickly and efficiently as possible through the maze of an ever-growing technological library environment.

3. Access

a. Users will need fast and efficient access to an increasing variety of information, whether it be in-house or through remote access.

b. Users will need both traditional and technological access tools.

4. Facilities

a. Users will continue to need space for a variety of uses (i.e., studying, reading, use of non-circulating materials, and use of Library equipment).

b. Users will need a comfortable library environment (i.e., clean, quiet, temperature-controlled, well-lighted, and well-ventilated.

5. Technology/Equipment

a. Users will need technology which is useful, dependable, reliable, and not too expensive to the user.

b. Users will need equipment which will enable them to process, interpret and/or make copies of the information they find (i.e., typewriters, microcomputers, microform readers, printers, and copy machines).

6. Staffing

a. Users will need a Library staff which is courteous, helpful, well-informed, well-trained, able to anticipate user needs and available to fulfill those needs.

RECOMMENDATIONS

If the Library's future is to be one of excellence, it must contribute to the development of an educated and informed constituency. The Library must react to change while it effects change; it must respond to the needs of its users while guiding them toward defining those needs. The following recommendations prescribe a course of action that seeks to support our users in an increasingly competitive information society. It proposes fundamental changes in our relationship to our constituency. It incorporates dynamic changes taking place in library technology and scholarly research while remaining rooted in traditional strategies for improvement. While our primary recommendations center on user education and awareness, we recognize that quality staff, resources, and equipment will play an essential role in the future viability of the Library.

The Task Force recommends the following:

1. that the Library establish a tailored and comprehensive user education program as detailed in section II of this report.

2. that the Library establish a revitalized promotion and awareness program as detailed in section III of this report.

3. that the Library take a proactive role on campus and through leadership and high visibility establish strong cooperative relationships with its primary constituency (the faculty in particular).

4. that, as part of the leadership role, the Library support a comprehensive staff development program which would include training in library technology, as well as training in patron interaction techniques.

5. that the Library consider offering a series of workshops for public services staff which would include instruction in interviewing techniques, online search strategies, attitude and image projection, communication techniques, stress management, and confidence building techniques.

6. that the Library provide the appropriate resources (collection development) and equipment needed to support teaching and research on campus, thereby assisting the University in attracting the best faculty and student body possible.

7. that the Library acquire an online catalog that contains all local holdings, cataloged and in-process, and has boolean logic with key-word search capabilities, and an efficient response time.

8. that the Library work to provide remote access to the Library online systems, including the catalog, circulation records, serials records and acquisition records.

9. that the Library establish a comprehensive, integrated reference collection for the Main Library's Humanities and Social Sciences materials, housed in one location to provide better access and instructional use by Library staff.

10. that the Library establish a Reference Librarian Roundtable to discuss new resources, changes in scholarly research, applications of developing technologies, and the formation of constituency relationships.

11. that the Library provide equipment of sufficient quality and quantity for the patron's information processing needs (i.e., copy machines, printers, word processors, typewriters, microform readers).

12. that the Library provide end-user access to all available non-commercial databases at a central location (i.e., at all appropriate reference desks): RLIN, OCLC, ORION, UCSB online catalog.

13. that the Library keep up with developing technologies related to access to external resources (especially with Interlibrary Loan).

14. that the Library consider the user's need (especially undergraduates) for study space and a quiet environment a top priority issue to be addressed in the planning of the new Library addition and the redesign of the present building.

15. that the Library negotiate with the campus administration to provide additional study space for students somewhere else on campus.

16. that the Library consider the use of a professional, objective, outside consultant for periodic evaluation of Library programs on an ongoing basis.

17. that the Library establish an ongoing evaluation process to periodically evaluate users' needs and the Library's success in meeting those needs.

Section II

USER EDUCATION/LIBRARY INSTRUCTION

METHODOLOGY

The User Education subgroup prepared a detailed action plan to organize its approach to the investigation of library instruction. The action plan is explained here in narrative form. Through a literature search, the subgroup developed an extensive working bibliography on user education/library instruction. This bibliography was used: 1) to gather recent information and expert opinions on the subject of user education and library instruction in academic research libraries; 2) to determine the library skills and research concepts which will be needed by the users of the UCSB Library; 3) to identify the types and methods of library guidance in research and instruction that are currently needed and that will be needed 5-10 years in the future; 4) to analyze, assess, and compare the strengths and weaknesses of the Library's current instructional activities program to those at other institutions; and 5) to document the Task Force report and to substantiate our findings and recommendations.

The subgroup gathered statistics on instructional activities from department heads and from those librarians who are involved in library instruction (library courses, in-class instruction, course-related instruction, online data services, and orientation).

The subgroup conducted interviews with twelve UCSB Library staff members (academic, management, and classified) (Appendix V). These interviewees provided reliable information about the strengths and weaknesses of the current instructional activities program. In addition, they offered new ideas and suggestions for extending and improving the Library's instructional services.

In consultation with David Russell, Oral Historian, the subgroup prepared a set of fundamental questions which was consistently covered in each interview. The interviews were scheduled and conducted in late November and early December 1985. The responses obtained from these interviews provided an abundance of valuable and candid information. These confidential face-to-face interviews were a more effective method for obtaining detailed information than were the surveys.

The subgroup contacted twenty-two resource persons (Appendix V). Their valuable advice, information, ideas, materials, and professional expertise greatly aided the subgroup in

conducting a thorough and objective study of the Library's current instructional activities program. These resource persons along with the interviewees and the survey respondents helped determine the role and program configuration of an improved quality program of instructional activities over the next 5-10 years.

Pertinent responses from the user and staff surveys were then read, analyzed and correlated with information which was gathered from the other sources. The subgroup then used an adaptation of the Kurt Lewin Force Field Analysis instrument as a framework to organize and analyze the gathered information and write the optimal scenario/primary recommendation. The analysis involved the following steps. The subgroup: 1) described the current user education program and identified problem areas, 2) stated an ideal user education program, 3) listed factors which may influence the current and the desired program, 4) sorted the factors into driving and restraining forces, 5) identified the two or three strongest forces on each side, and 6) developed ideas for strengthening the driving forces and/or reducing the restraining forces.

FINDINGS

SUMMARY OF CURRENT LIBRARY EDUCATION AND INSTRUCTIONAL ACTIVITIES

The Library currently offers orientation tours through the general Reference Department (Social Sciences/Humanities Reference) at the beginning of each quarter. Orientation tours are also provided through other Library departments when requested (i.e., Sciences/Engineering and Arts Library). When requested, additional individualized orientation tours are provided by librarians to new campus faculty, community organizations, and groups of high school students (i.e., Physics and Chemistry students at local area high schools). Campus orientation tours (which include the University Library) are provided by campus offices through the Campus Orientation in Cheadle Hall. More attention should be paid to the tours that are provided by departments and programs outside of the University Library. Lastly, a brochure entitled A Walking Tour of the UCSB Library is available in the Library for those patrons desiring to tour the Library's main service points at their own speed.

Currently the Library offers two elective courses in library instruction for undergraduates through the Interdisciplinary Studies program. These courses are: Interdisciplinary Studies 1: Library Skills and Interdisciplinary Studies 100 : Library Research Bibliography 1. Library Skills consists

of three lectures that are given over a ten week quarter (introductory lecture, review session, and final exam) and a basic introductory self-paced workbook which the students are allowed to do at their own pace. Library Skills is offered for one credit with P/NP (Passed/Not Passed) grading which is not computed into the student's grade point average. Additionally, there are no workshops, lab sessions, or teaching assistants to help the students with understanding how the library is organized. The second course offered is Library Research Bibliography 1 which consists of two one-hour lectures each week during the quarter. Library Research Bibliography 1 is offered for two credits with P/NP grading. A central course requirement is a critical annotated bibliography.

The teaching assignments for both courses rotate among the librarians in the Reference Department only. These courses take a general reference orientation--they are not subject oriented towards developing research skills in a medium-to-large university campus.

In addition to these courses some librarians are responsible for and/or involved in teaching courses that are offered through the academic departments. Currently there is no coordination of these teaching responsibilities nor a cross-listing of these courses with an organized program in library instruction and research methods.

In addition to the two courses in Interdisciplinary Studies, the following regularly scheduled in-class instruction is given by some librarians in courses that are part of an established academic department.

1. Black Studies 196, Bibliographic Methods in Black Research, (4 credits). Prerequisite : upper division standing.
2. Chemistry 184, Chemical Literature, (2 credits). Has not been taught since Fall 1983.
3. Chemistry 184G, Chemical Literature, (2 credits). Has not been taught since Fall 1983.
4. Chicano Studies 191 D, Documentary Research in Chicano Studies, (4 credits).
5. Interdisciplinary Studies 110, Information Resources in the Sciences and Engineering, (2 credits). Course not offered at the present time.
6. Music 112 L, Introduction to Music Library Techniques, (2 credits). Course has been recently reinstated after not being taught since Spring 1983.
7. Political Science 49, Library Research Methods in Political Science, (2 credits).

Course-related instruction consisting of one-or-more lectures given by a librarian to regularly scheduled

courses on campus is listed in Appendix VI. This instruction is arranged through the cooperation of the faculty member in charge. Courses/seminars/workshops that are offered through UCSB extension, continuing education, and instructional sessions that are not attached to a specific class have not been included in the list.

These findings have been compiled from the user and staff survey, from Library staff interviews, from resource persons in the UC system and at other institutions, from observations and opinions which were voiced by Task Force members, from E.S.C.I. student evaluations of the Interdisciplinary Studies courses, and from a literature search (see bibliography).

The mission of the University focuses on instruction and research. The Task Force believes that the Library should encompass and reflect both of these areas while acting as a central resource for the academic departments and research institutes on the UCSB campus.

In some cases, the findings from the different sources were in conflict with one another. Those contradictions sometimes reflected a difference between user and staff perception of need, and a lack of awareness of current practice. Those differences have been taken into consideration and are pointed out in the following discussion.

1. Interviews with a number of UCSB faculty revealed a receptivity to the idea of more library instruction at both the faculty and student level. This openness, however, was not strongly voiced by faculty who responded to the user survey. Only one-tenth responded that librarians giving course-related lectures in the classroom would be very effective, while one-third opted for librarians working individually with students. Faculty further indicated a disinterest in teaching library skills themselves. Faculty receptivity to more instruction may be low because of a lack of an effective library instruction and user awareness program. Faculty need more awareness of what is offered. Librarians should take a more active lead in developing with the faculty cooperative relations focusing on instructional needs as well as on collection development.

2. Some Library staff were highly critical of the current user education program (particularly the Interdisciplinary Studies 1 and 100 courses). While positive feedback was received on individual assistance, on a concerned, dedicated, friendly staff, and on course-related instruction, some staff members consider the current program to be weak and ineffective overall. They perceive an uneven distribution of staff efforts as well as a program lacking coordination, planning, direction, cohesiveness, continuity,

specific program goals and objectives, and an effective mechanism for evaluation. They see the program as not being relevant to user needs, and not reaching enough of the campus community. Many thought library instruction should be mandatory for undergraduates, and should also be directed at specific groups such as transfer, re-entry, and foreign students. The fact that one-third of the staff who answered the survey left this question blank indicates an unawareness of what is currently being offered in this program. A broad-based, library-wide program of instruction that builds on our strengths by offering more subject-specific courses would be relevant to our users, and would reach more students. A redesign of the current Interdisciplinary Studies 1 and 100 courses would help bring them up-to-date by including not only basic library skills, but introduction to reference materials, advanced research methods, and online searching. Moreover, a full-time library instruction coordinator with responsibility for developing and evaluating an expanded user education program would provide more direction, cohesiveness, and continuity.

3. The undergraduate and graduate students want and need more individualized instruction and research guidance at their point-of-use. Only half of the graduates and one-third of the undergraduates indicated that staff members were available when the students needed them. The survey respondents also suggested expanding reference service on nights and weekends. Obviously there are not enough librarians to give individual help to all users. User demand is for more staff and more personal service, however the current staffing configuration will not accommodate this. Users do not want librarians to merely point to reference materials, but instead to explain their relevance and use.

4. The user survey indicated that some students do not want to take a formal credit course covering the full range of library services in order to learn how to use the resources and services in their area effectively. In order to reach a broader range of users, the Library may need to explore more creative user education methods involving developing technologies. Faculty are now using microcomputers to develop instruction and research aids. Librarians should design tutorials intended to teach users to effectively make use of computer-related systems such as the MELVYL catalog, online reference tutorials, or other computer-assisted instruction.

5. The use of the online search services has diminished in recent years (Appendix IV). This may be due in part to lack of promotion, and in part to the great amount of assistance needed to use the services. The survey revealed that graduates prefer to work independently from staff, and that all students prefer a direct and fast approach to

information. What is more, few end-users can make independent, effective use of the online systems, although some users, especially those in the Sciences, want more end-user access to the online search systems available through the Library. Creative and innovative ways to educate users and increase the awareness of potential online users is needed. Furthermore, staff should be capable of giving up-to-date information on available online resources, search strategies, and evolving database features. Workshops on online searching directed at users in the various disciplines should be a component of an expanded instruction program. Finally, a full-time coordinator would be instrumental in maintaining a revitalized, high quality online research assistance program. The coordinator should work closely with the Coordinator of Instructional Services.

6. Users want more instruction on the use of the MELVYL online catalog. Dissatisfaction and confusion regarding the MELVYL catalog was reiterated by all user groups. Part of the problem is that users lack awareness of its capabilities and limitations. Respondents to the user survey also indicated a need for improved written instruction on the MELVYL catalog as well as more MELVYL catalog staff assistance. Our users for the most part have not invested their own time and energy to learn how to use the MELVYL catalog. A commitment to understanding user receptivity to new technology is necessary to reduce user dissatisfaction with new systems.

7. Users want to know how to efficiently and effectively use the major access tools in their field. The survey revealed that students were interested primarily in those tools which would help them with their immediate assignments and interests. Many graduates responded that knowledge of available reference tools was a high priority. A series of seminars, taught by subject specialists, that deal with creative research methods and new resources, both traditional and online, should be established to update faculty and to establish stronger ties with them. Many staff remarked on the scattering of reference tools in the stacks as being a hindrance to effective use of those materials. Those tools need to be brought together for more effective use and higher visibility. Librarians may even need to be reintroduced to these materials and their usefulness. It is important that all staff (both academic and classified) in contact with the public have a knowledge of the basic reference tools related to their discipline for referral purposes, especially as research becomes more and more interdisciplinary.

8. Users expressed an interest in subject-related orientation and tours. Some graduates suggested tours and orientation meetings limited to graduates in order to become acquainted with staff responsible for assistance and

collection development in their area of research. The general tours are not well received by many users. A majority (70%) of graduates are aware of the current tours, but do not use them. Graduates also requested that orientation information be sent directly to them. This is in keeping with graduate desires to receive only direct and relevant information. Subject-specific orientation and tours for new faculty would also be of benefit. General and subject-specific tours should also be directed toward special groups such as re-entry, transfer, and foreign students.

9. The Library staff (both academic and classified) need and want training and development opportunities to assist them in providing efficient and effective guidance and instruction to the users. This includes training and development in instructional methods, new technologies, and new resources. Many staff (70%) indicated in the staff survey that staff need more education about where to refer users to other service points within the Library. Half of the staff indicated they need more specific knowledge about collections/information sources in other Library departments. Others noted a need for library instructors with quality teaching skills. To meet these needs, the Library should provide opportunities and support for staff to become more knowledgeable about other resources in the Library and to improve skills in communication, instruction, and computer literacy. Teaching skills should be kept up-to-date so as to effectively use both traditional and technological resources. An in-house staff development and training program to focus on all these aspects of user assistance would improve staff confidence, competence, instructional performance and relations with users.

10. The staff survey indicated that all groups of users need more awareness of both the Library's resources and services. Users themselves, however, do not want to go out of their way to explore the Library on their own and are mainly interested in specific types of information and orientation. Students generally want answers only when they have a need for that information. The Library needs to take some innovative approaches to reaching its users. Informing users of the Library's services is a form of instruction in itself. Ongoing promotion of the instructional services should be a high priority of an expanded user education program.

Current user instruction activities are general in nature; for the most part they are not designed to reach specific groups. They are available to the user who finds out about them, but a large number of students do not know about them or are not interested because they are too general. Users want more guidance and instruction, but they want these to be highly relevant to their immediate needs. Along with

current traditional methods of library research, all users will be faced with increasing amounts of automated information systems. The user education program of the future must prepare the user for these new library tools, using all available methods from traditional courses to creative computerized instruction. Staff must be given opportunities to keep pace with this ever changing environment.

PRIMARY RECOMMENDATION AND OPTIMAL SCENARIO

I. INTRODUCTION

The consensus of the User Needs and Education Task Force is that an improved and expanded program of library instruction/user education is needed at UCSB. The Task Force hopes that this optimal scenario will be used by the Library administration as a basis for planning, implementing and evaluating an improved program of educational services over the next five to ten years. We trust that this recommended scenario will assist the Library administration in developing a new framework of instructional policies and strategies which will result in directly benefiting the users of the Library's resources and services.

II. ROLE OF LIBRARY INSTRUCTION/USER EDUCATION

The Task Force has defined library instruction as those educational services which are offered by the Library for the purpose of teaching or guiding its users in making efficient and effective use of the Library's facilities, resources and services. In its broadest sense, a program of library instruction encompasses all formal and informal kinds of instruction, guidance and assistance used to educate the users, including any orientation and publicity that increases awareness of the Library's resources, services and facilities. In this report, the terms library instruction and user education are used interchangeably.

The Task Force recommends that the Library adopt and implement the concept of the "teaching library" as defined and described in the two articles, "The Academic Library as a Teaching Library: A Role for the 1980's", written by Alan E. Guskin, Carla J. Stoffle, and Joseph A. Boissé, and "Teaching, Research and Service: The Academic Library's Role", by Carla J. Stoffle, Alan E. Guskin and Joseph A. Boissé. (see bibliography). The Task Force believes that the philosophy and principles of the teaching library

concept, as stated in these articles, will serve as excellent guidelines for developing an extended, improved, and comprehensive program of library instruction at UCSB. The role of library user education in the future, as we conceive it to be, is also embodied in the teaching library concept, and is defined by the authors as

"...a library which is not only a support service for academic programs, but which is itself actively and directly involved in implementing the mission of higher education: teaching, research, and community service..."

We believe that the educational philosophy outlined in these articles is one which is ideally suited to the academic environment at UCSB. Adopting this concept of user education will give the Library a central role in the educational process as it actively seeks to fulfill the mission of the University of California at the Santa Barbara campus.

The main objectives of a program of library instruction are to support the instructional goals of the academic departments and programs, to promote research, to foster and encourage creative thinking, and to serve the non-academic community.

The Task Force therefore recommends that an expanded, improved and comprehensive program of instructional services be planned, implemented and evaluated at this campus.

III. A DESCRIPTION OF THE PROPOSED USER EDUCATION PROGRAM

The library user education program to be developed and implemented at this campus must be both user-centered and user-friendly. In order for it to function effectively it must focus on meeting and satisfying the informational and educational needs of the users.

The program must recognize each user's individual right to access the information that meets his/her needs.

With a united, pervasive working philosophy of service, the program must demonstrate concern for the users' needs.

The program must try to effectively reach each user with instruction, guidance, and assistance offered at the users' point-of-need for information and services. It should continue to place primary emphasis on individualized, personalized, one- on-one instruction.

The program must recognize the various layers and levels of informational needs required to satisfy class assignments, research and independent study.

It must provide multiple approaches to library instruction, focusing on user satisfaction. It must be designed to foster positive learning behavior.

The ultimate goal of the program should be the development of self-reliant users who are able to make efficient and effective use of the Library's resources and services. Whenever possible, it should foster user self-sufficiency and provide guided self-reliance. While ensuring that informational needs are satisfied, this program should contribute significantly to the general education and self-directed lifelong learning of the users.

The program should strive towards providing instruction and guidance that ensures the user's successful access to and effective use of information.

It should offer many kinds and levels of instruction which are transparent to the user, thereby making the pathways to needed information as quick and easy to use as possible.

The program should be determined by the user's informational and instructional needs, but it should also be responsive to those needs as they change and evolve. The instruction offered must be perceived by the users to be important and relevant to their needs in order to generate self-motivated learners and researchers.

A thorough analysis of the extensive information gathered during this study has provided the Task Force with answers to questions that must be considered before a new program configuration of instructional services is designed. These findings have been analyzed and synthesized into broad categorical statements which should serve as a foundation to the construction of this program. These comprehensive statements may also function as guidelines when instructional goals and objectives are developed for the overall program and each of its components.

The informational needs of the users combine library skill with academic skill. Library users must be able to gather information and conduct research. They must know how to evaluate and analyze this information in order to convert it into usable knowledge. And finally, they must know how to report this knowledge based on gathered information.

In order to make effective and efficient use of the Library's resources, services and facilities our users must know what information, resources and services are available, how to access them and how to operate within the procedural

mechanics of the Library, understanding how this information is acquired, organized and disseminated within the Library system.

An improved, comprehensive program of library instruction must be one that informs its users about its resources, services and facilities. It must teach beginning, intermediate and advanced research concepts, strategies and skills, encompassing the variety of access tools and sources. It must teach users how the Library operates its systems of acquisitions, organization, and dissemination of information.

IV. RECOMMENDED USER EDUCATION PROGRAM CONFIGURATION

The Task Force has identified four major groups of Library users which would benefit from an improved program of instructional development at this University. In addition to the primary constituency of faculty and academic staff, graduates and undergraduates, the Task Force also recognizes the campus administration and staff.

The Task Force recommends the development of a library instruction program which is comprehensive in its scope. It must recognize the differences as well as similarities among these user groups, tailoring the kinds and levels of instruction, guidance and assistance to their respective needs. This comprehensive program configuration should be a full and balanced program as described in the articles on the role of the teaching library.

The following methods of educating our Library users are designed to meet the needs of each group while a certain amount of overlap exists between them.

A. For the Undergraduates

1. Personally-conducted orientation tours of the Library's resources, services and facilities, for all new students. Tours may be general or focused on broad discipline, conducted in cooperation with the College of Letters and Science, College of Engineering, and College of Creative Studies.

2. Course-related tours and presentations given in the Library upon faculty request.

3. Film, video or slide-sound presentations orienting undergraduates to the Library's facilities, resources and services.

4. Individualized, personalized point-of-need assistance and point-of-use guidance to the Library's resources, services and facilities.

5. Upon faculty request, in-class lectures and presentations of Library services as they relate to course needs.

6. Library components or units of instruction developed in cooperation with faculty, and integrated into specific course structures.

7. Credit courses focused on major disciplines, teaching beginning and intermediate library research skills and critical thinking concepts.

8. Self-paced, point-of-need interdisciplinary research exercises and worksheets designed to teach specific research concepts and strategies.

9. Topic-focused research workshops and presentations, (i.e., literature, art, biography, biological science, music, language studies, etc.)

10. Term paper, research paper and senior thesis advisory service, clinics and consultations.

11. Instruction and guidance for online search services and information systems.

12. Instruction labs for the MELVYL online catalog, including demonstrations, self-paced exercises, worksheets, online tutorials and other aids.

13. Computer-assisted instruction (CAI) to teach library research concepts and strategies, use of online search services, library procedures, and use of major access tools. Provide user education software packages.

14. Instruction and guidance to special groups of undergraduates, (i.e., foreign students, minority students, handicapped students, transfer and re-entry students).

15. Printed instructional aids and materials, signs, handouts, research aids, brochures on major access tools, publicity and promotion of resources and services for academic disciplines.

16. Library displays and exhibits.

B. For the Graduates

1. Personally-conducted orientation tours, focused on specific disciplines, developed in coordination with the orientation program of the Graduate Division.

2. Film, video or slide-sound presentations directed to graduate studies, orienting graduates to the Library's resources, services and facilities.

3. Individualized, personalized point-of-need assistance and point-of-use guidance to the Library's resources, services and facilities.

4. Credit courses offered by broad discipline, teaching advanced research concepts and critical thinking skills.

5. Subject-focused research workshops where intermediate and advanced library research skills, methodologies, strategies and critical thinking concepts are brought to bear on a particular subject or broad discipline.

6. Upon faculty request, in-class or in-library presentations emphasizing course-related research skills, methodologies and sources of information.

7. Research paper and thesis/dissertation counseling on an individual basis, offered in cooperation with academic departments.

8. Seminars for teaching assistants, coordinated with the Graduate Divisions and the academic departments.

9. Graduate research seminars given by librarians to appropriate classes in the 200 series, with a focus on specialized research.

10. Instruction and guidance to online search services and information systems, training end-users to search appropriate online data bases and other access tools, including remote access services as developed.

11. Computer-assisted instruction, providing user education software packages to meet graduate student needs.

12. Subject-focused instructional aids, pathfinders, research exercises, self-paced worksheets offered at points-of-use and points-of-need.

13. Publicity and promotion of Library services and resources, aimed at graduate students.

14. Library displays and exhibits.

C. For Faculty and Academic Staff

1. Individual contacts made by librarians with members of the faculty to informally promote awareness of the Library's potential as related to their research and teaching needs. Offer to work with faculty members in developing library research modules and assignments for class instruction.

2. Keep faculty informed of important research materials, special collections, RLG and other services related to their interests and needs.

3. Offer faculty update seminars which focus on specific Library resources and services. Explain library policies and promote services and resources.

4. Through subject recommenders, share information, route articles and keep faculty members aware of new resources in their fields.

5. Actively promote awareness of Library services and resources with academic departments and programs and Faculty Senate.

6. Offer information services to faculty via scholar's remote workstations, as technology develops.

7. Provide individualized research guidance and assistance to faculty, and teaching and research assistants.

8. Provide library-directed instruction for online searching services to faculty members.

9. Design attractive brochures directed to faculty members, explaining the Library's services and resources.

10. Library displays and exhibits.

D. For the Campus Administration and Staff

1. Offer special Library tours for campus administrators and annual "administrator's update" presentations.

2. Design and distribute flyers describing Library services. Offer ideas and assistance for job-related uses of library information resources, targeting specific staff groups such as Counseling Services, Job Placement Center, Women's Center, Administrative

Assistants, departmental secretaries, and the Personnel Department.

3. Offer personalized research assistance and document delivery service to busy administrators.

4. As developed, promote remote access services and assistance via computers and telecommunication to the Library's information resources.

5. Route interesting journal articles or books on higher education, student population trends and academic administration to appropriate administrators as a Library courtesy service.

6. Promote recreational use of the Library.

V. APPROACHES TO IMPLEMENTING A COMPREHENSIVE USER EDUCATION PROGRAM CONFIGURATION

It is very important that the preceding configuration of instructional offerings and activities be carefully developed and systematically implemented over the next five to ten years. As it is impossible and undesirable to offer this broad-based user education configuration all at once, each of the program's components and activities should be carefully chosen, planned, and targeted to a specific group of users, offered on a regular basis, tested and evaluated for effectiveness in meeting user needs.

The Task Force recommends that the following approaches be taken when implementing the comprehensive program configuration of user education.

The program should be offered to our users as a practical program of educational support services which are ultimately integrated into the educational goals of this University. This program should contribute to an improvement in the quality of instruction and learning in support of the academic research environment by promoting independent study and lifelong learning as both a campus and a community service. The program should build and maintain a new image of the UCSB Library as a teaching, research and community service library.

The program configuration should be integrated into the rest of the Library's public services, coordinating all aspects of Library service into one functioning whole. The program configuration should be consistent, coherent to the users, and cover a logical continuum that accommodates the needs of the students, faculty, and staff at various levels. This united, pervasive, working philosophy of service

demonstrates our concerns for the needs of our users and *also will be our strongest user awareness statement.*

The program should be developed in collaboration with the faculty so that each component effectively meets the academic needs of the faculty and students.

It should place a high priority on providing more and better initial orientation, and subject-specific instruction for undergraduate and graduate students. Turning the Library into a "teaching library" will help to focus our attention and efforts on instruction for the largest group of users.

Before each component or activity of the program is introduced, there must be careful planning, complete with written statements of measurable instructional objectives and desired learning outcomes. These will help to build an effective evaluation mechanism into each component which can be used to determine if the component is contributing to the program's overall goals and priorities. Explicitly stated instructional objectives are crucial to the success of the improved program.

The Library's program should take a long-range approach to developing and implementing instruction which supports the interdisciplinary studies programs at this campus. In the course of its study, the Task Force contacted faculty members involved in teaching interdisciplinary studies, to discuss if and where an improved program configuration might be most needed and most easily integrated into the academic curriculum. The Task Force learned that the door is wide open to the introduction of library instruction modules into the many interdisciplinary writing courses and programs offered to our students. An opportunity exists for the Library to contribute instructional support to the following academic departments and programs:

Department of English (English 1, 2A, 2B, 42)
Interdisciplinary Writing Program
Medieval Studies Program
Renaissance Studies Program
Program of Intensive English (PIE)
Undergraduate Diversified Program
Graduate School of Education
South Coast Writing Project (SCWriP)
College of Creative Studies
Center for Academic Skills Enrichment (CASE)
Summer Transitional Enrichment Program (STEP)
UCSB Tutorial Center

The Task Force recommends that the Library initiate contacts with the teaching faculty in the area of the multidisciplinary studies. Faculty members contacted seem to be receptive to working cooperatively with the Library in

developing course-related library instructional components designed to improve the students' abilities to conduct research, to think critically, and to write effectively. The writing core courses offer an excellent means of reaching many hundreds of undergraduate students with needed, relevant instructional services across the wide spectrum of the curriculum.

In tandem with the interdisciplinary approach described above, the improved program configuration should be based on a unified conceptual approach to teaching and learning. The Task Force recommends that a strong conceptual framework be built into the entire content of the program and that a greater emphasis be placed on teaching beginning and advanced library research, information handling, critical thinking and problem solving skills. Each component or activity of the program should incorporate cognitive and behavioral learning theory into its instructional design.

The Task Force recommends that the Interdisciplinary 1-Library Skills and the Interdisciplinary 100-Library Research Bibliography 1 credit courses be completely redesigned to reflect this approach. The Task Force foresees the exciting potential role of an interdisciplinary program of library instruction which actively collaborates with the faculty in teaching students to think across the traditional boundaries in the curriculum. In the next five to ten years, the program should seek to combine the best of the library research process with the critical thinking process and bring this combination to bear on the whole curriculum.

Any improved program configuration of user education must continue to be strongly supported with individualized, personalized, one-on-one instruction, guidance and assistance. Any increase in user awareness and instruction will result in more sophisticated demands for assistance. The improved program configuration should be combined with an increased user awareness program and a large, competent and friendly public services staff to instruct and assist individual users at their point-of-need.

VI. KEY FACTORS IMPACTING THE DEVELOPMENT OF THE USER EDUCATION PROGRAM

A. Commitment and Support of the Library Administration

A strong administrative commitment is vital to extending and improving the instructional services program if it is to become the flagship of the Library. The Task Force has ascertained that the University Librarian and the Associate

University Librarian for Services believe that user *education is very important;* both administrators are strongly committed to the role that it plays in fulfilling the educational mission and goals of this campus.

B. Faculty Support and Cooperation

In order for the Library's instructional program to be successful at this campus, a concerted effort must be made to improve the relationship between faculty and librarians. The Task Force recommends that the Library aggressively collaborate with faculty in the development of a new program of instructional services. By taking the initiative in developing collegial working relations with individual faculty members, we have an opportunity to find out where we are needed by faculty and where our program of educational support services can be best accepted in the classroom and the academic departments and programs. The librarians at UCSB must become "missionaries" to the academic departments where avenues of communication and collaboration are established with faculty members. Obtaining, maintaining, and sustaining faculty and campus administrative support for all Library services is vital to the implementation of more course-related and in-class instruction.

C. Improved Access to Information

The user surveys indicate a need by both faculty and students for quicker and easier access to the Library's information resources. If the Library intends to occupy a central role in providing information on this campus, the major goal of an extended, improved library instruction program must be to efficiently and effectively facilitate user access to needed information. A major challenge facing the Library over the next decade will be to develop innovative ways to educate library users who will be making increased use of developing technology to access needed information. As a network of information technology is implemented on this campus, librarians must take the lead in facilitating access to information by ensuring that our users are aware of and able to make effective use of the instruction that is built into this network.

The Task Force therefore recommends that the Library assume an inter-campus perspective in planning and implementing educational services that will facilitate direct user access to information via the UCSB campus' and Library's current and future information access systems and services. User awareness and education have a direct bearing on the ease of access to information. The Library should take immediate steps to make access quicker and easier for the users by offering more instruction and assistance in the effective use of existing technology and access tools.

This instruction should include teaching the users how to:

1. use the MELVYL online catalog to access books by author, title and subject;

2. access serials using the MELVYL catalog and the serials list;

3. find periodical and journal articles using InfoTrac and the other printed and online indexing and abstracting access tools.

As new technology is developed and made available to all users at this campus in the next decade, it will be necessary to think of creative new ways of orienting and instructing them to the effective use of that technology in satisfying their informational needs. The Task Force predicts users may need instructional development and guidance in the following areas:

1. the use of all access tools (printed and automated), needed by the users for accessing library information;

2. awareness of and instruction in remote access services;

3. the use of videodisc, optical disk, CD-ROM, video-tex and other optical based technologies;

4. end-user instruction in use of online commercial and non-commercial bibliographic, textual and numeric data bases;

5. computer-assisted instruction for library research, critical thinking and writing skills, library procedures, access tools, etc.;

6. the use of the UCSB Library's integrated online system;

7. the use of the Library's resource sharing services;

8. the use of technical services to access needed information, i.e., authority records and files, online bibliographic record formats, classification systems, etc.

D. Quantity and Quality of the Instructional Services Staff

The success and effectiveness of an expanded user education program will, to a large degree, be dependent upon the abilities and energies of the public service staff directly involved with the program. Our study has revealed a need for definite action in improving the quantity and quality of the public services staff involved in user orientation, library

instruction and research assistance activities. Therefore, it is recommended that the Library administration reallocate existing staff resources to support a new and improved user education program.

Our study findings indicate a strong recommendation from the Library staff for education and career development opportunities which would prepare staff members to more effectively and efficiently teach, assist and guide the users of the Library's resources and services.

The Task Force strongly recommends that the first order of business in developing a user-centered program of instructional services must be the education or re-education of the public services staff so that the philosophy of service and professional attitudes towards our users are uniformly positive and consistently demonstrated throughout this Library.

A substantive, meaningful in-house staff education and development program will provide an excellent means of improving instructional staff morale, performance and competency, inclusive of teaching, communication, and public speaking/presentation skills, and consequently the relationship between the Library and its users. This program would contribute to overcoming staff negativism, pessimism, resistance to change and the fear of being overworked.

E. Promoting Awareness and a Need for the Program

No instructional program, no matter how well planned and implemented, will succeed unless the users perceive their need for it and are made aware of its existence and availability. The Task Force recommends that the new program of user education be aggressively promoted and well publicized so that the users are made aware of the Library's instructional role on this campus.

VII. RECOMMENDED ORGANIZATIONAL STRUCTURE AND STAFFING PATTERN FOR THE LIBRARY INSTRUCTION PROGRAM

The Task Force recommends that the Library administration establish a separate instructional services unit, made up of staff with specified responsibilities for instruction. Although the general Reference Department staff will continue to occupy a role in the user education program, user orientation and library instruction cannot and should not become the province of any one Library department. Instead, the instructional services should be carefully planned and integrated into the other public services offered to the users in every Library department. The

instructional services should then be coordinated as a library-wide program. The Task Force believes that this will be the most effective and workable approach to the organizational structure for the development of the extended, improved library instruction program described in this optimal scenario.

There are several practical advantages to this library-wide program structure. First, instruction can be made available whenever students and faculty need it, rather than when it fits in around the staff's reference desk duties or other public service assignments. Having the flexibility to offer instruction when it is convenient for and needed by the users is especially important during the first few years, as the instructional staff works closely with the faculty in the development of a program which integrates library instruction into the academic curriculum.

Another advantage is that the instructional staff can be selected from any Library department in order to accommodate the orientation and instructional needs of the users as they arise. Staff members with special teaching abilities, subject expertise and communication skills can be called upon to provide instruction as an integral part of their assigned responsibilities. This is particularly important if the quality of the subject-focused orientation, library instruction and research guidance is to be of a higher and more uniform level.

A third advantage to having a separate instructional services unit is that it will provide a new visibility and lend a new importance to library use instruction at this campus. The establishment of an effectively coordinated instructional services program will do a great deal to improve the Library's image on this campus, as it has done at the Berkeley and Irvine campuses.

Believing that the user education program offered to our users should be a unified, cohesive program, the Task Force recommends that, regardless of the method of program staffing selected by the Library administration, a full time Coordinator of Instructional Services be designated for the UCSB Library. The Task Force recommends that the Coordinator position be a librarian with administrative duties that parallel those at the Berkeley and Irvine campuses. The Coordinator should report to the Associate University Librarian for Services and should be delegated the authority for planning, implementing, coordinating and evaluating the comprehensive program of instructional services.

The specific responsiblities of this position should include:

1. Working with the Library administration and the instructional staff in planning a comprehensive, pervasive program of library use instruction. Implementing and coordinating a planned sequence of actions in the development of this program.

2. Working with the Library administration and the faculty to develop the instructional program's goals, objectives, priorities and content. Maintaining a liaison with the faculty to ensure the program's responsiveness to the instructional and research needs of the UCSB campus. Establishing faculty contact and facilitating communication between faculty members, the library departments and the instructional staff. Serving as the primary contact between the instructional staff and the academic departments, programs and other campus groups.

3. Coordinating all user education services and activities, ensuring consistency and coherence of the program. Planning and scheduling of all instruction and orientation activities. Maintaining accurate statistics of all instructional activities.

4. Developing and evaluating traditional as well as creative instructional aids and materials. Designing publicity and promoting the Library's user access and instructional services with the faculty, students and campus staff.

5. Evaluating the effectiveness of the user education program and all of the program's components and activities. Producing staff education, training and development relating to the library's instruction and orientation services. Evaluating the instructional services performance of Library staff involved in the user education program.

The Task Force recommends that an Instructional Services Coordinating Committee be appointed by the Library administration. The Coordinating Committee should be composed of instructional staff members from the public services areas of the Reference Department, Science and Engineering Library, Arts Library, Government Publications, Serials Department, Circulation Department, Special Collections, the Map and Imagery Laboratory as well as subject specialists in the non-public service areas. The committee should be chaired by the Coordinator of Instructional Services. Members of this committee would be responsible for working with the Coordinator to determine the direction of the program, to set plans for achievement, to develop goals, objectives and priorities, to provide public relations and user awareness, for staff education and the development of instructional services, to serve as

liaison with the instructional staff in their departments and to implement and evaluate the instructional program and its components.

The instructional staff should be composed of capable, well trained and enthusiastic individuals. The greatest part of the actual instruction should continue to be the responsibility of the librarians in the public service units. Librarians and other instructors should be selected to participate in the instructional program on the basis of their teaching ability, communications skills, technical and/or subject expertise as well as their motivation and commitment to the program. Those staff members having teaching or orientation responsibilities should have these responsibilities explicitly stated in their job descriptions; they should be held accountable for their performance and thoroughly evaluated for their instructional performance at review time. The Task Force also recommends that, in the future, the Library should recruit new staff with the expectation that they will have instruction responsibilities as appropriate to each position.

The Task Force recommends that adequate support staff assistance be provided for the library-wide instructional services unit. Clerical assistance will be needed to schedule instruction, orientation, and perform other office tasks that are needed in the preparation and promotion of instructional materials while maintaining all program-related statistics and other records.

VIII. RECOMMENDED COURSE OF ACTION FOR INITIAL PLANNING AND IMPLEMENTATION OF THE INSTRUCTIONAL SERVICES PROGRAM

It is estimated that it will take from five to ten years to establish a comprehensive library instruction program at this campus. The Task Force therefore recommends that the Library administration move quickly to begin initial planning and implementation of the expanded and improved user education program described in this report.

We suggest the following course of action to the University Librarian:

1. Appoint a full-time Coordinator of Instructional Services.

2. Establish the Instructional Services Coordinating Committee and appoint qualified members.

3. Formulate a policy statement and design the goals, objectives and priorities of the user education program.

4. Decide on which instructional services, program components and activities to offer first. Determine which groups of users will be targeted with specific kinds and levels of instruction.

5. Begin to profile the faculty and cooperatively develop in-class and course-related instruction. Promote the potential of the Library's resources and instructional services.

6. Educate the Library staff about the teaching library concept and their role in the program of instructional services so that they are able to educate the users.

7. Begin slowly to build the program in carefully planned stages.

Section III

USER AWARENESS

INTRODUCTION

Awareness of Library services provides a key to unlocking the vast assortment of Library resources, and is the first step towards educating our users. The basic charge to the Task Force was to identify the current levels of awareness among Library users and to propose methods for increasing awareness in the future.

Through analysis of the data gathered in the user survey, the staff survey, an inventory of available promotional tools, information shared by the Task Force on Access to Information, and an evaluation of present policies on promotional programs, we have discovered that awareness is an issue which greatly affects the patterns of use within the Library.

Present methods designed to increase user awareness of Library services and resources lack coordination. These methods are often too simplistic and do not take into consideration the users' varying levels of library experience. A unified program designed to increase awareness does not exist. What does exist lacks explicit policies, procedures, cohesion, focus or direction.

Promotion of services and resources takes place randomly. Many departments promote their own resources independently and in a variety of formats (Appendix X). While some of these promotional tools are well developed, most are outdated, out-of-print, or incomplete. Many of these promotional tools exist in printed formats and are available at the Reference/Information Desk. Others are dispersed among individual departments. Because there is no centralized location for all promotional materials, it is implied that the users must first know about each service before they can gain further knowledge of them. The Reference/Information Desk receives the majority of awareness related questions because it is the only information "headquarters" available to the users. This service point has the potential to reach the greatest number of users in need of information about Library services and resources.

FINDINGS

Results from the user and staff surveys point directly to a need for enhanced awareness of Library services. While the three groups--faculty, graduates and undergraduates--

exhibit varying degrees of awareness, certain awareness issues exist for all.

Library staff who maintain contact with the public at service points see room for increased awareness among all user groups, with the undergraduates being the most needy.

In the survey, the faculty revealed varying degrees of unawareness of Library services; 15% of the faculty were unaware of Arts Library Reference; 29% were unaware of the Art Exhibition Catalog collection; 23% were unaware of the Music Listening Facility; 36% were unaware of Technical Report Service; 20% were unaware of the Map & Imagery Lab; 45% were unaware of Curriculum Lab; 14% were unaware of Special Collections; 23% were unaware of Oriental Collections; 44% were unaware of Slavic materials assistance; 15% unaware of MELVYL assistance; and 18% unaware of computer searching. Some of these services are subject-specific, but others cross over into many, if not all, disciplines. The faculty are an important link to enhancing awareness of our student users; any investment towards increasing their awareness would be doubly beneficial.

Graduate students lack awareness of many of the same subject-specific services. More importantly, however, they are not fully aware of services designed to assist them in their academic program. Over 3/4 of our graduates surveyed are not using Interdisciplinary Studies 100 or 101 because they are unaware of it. A majority (64%) of the non-use of thesis advising is due to unawareness; 44% of the non-use of computer literature searches and 11% of the non-use of the tours and orientation program is due to unawareness.

Undergraduates exhibited relatively high rates of unawareness to all services not related to their primary use of the Library as a study hall,(i.e., Circulation, Reserve Book Service, and Reference/Information Desk). Again, many of those services that yielded high rates of unawareness are subject-specific and do not satisfy the broader undergraduate informational needs. Services that are not subject-specific, such as computer literature searches, tours and orientation, access to uncataloged items, purchase requests and Interlibrary Loan also yielded high rates of unawareness.

In their own opinion, as well as in others', undergraduates are the group most in need of education and awareness. Half of the undergraduates surveyed were not aware of the Interdisciplinary Studies classes. There is an obvious need for better methods of promoting this service.

Library staff stand to benefit from increased awareness of Library services as well. Over 3/4 of staff surveyed felt

that Library staff, including student assistants, need more information about Library service points in order to refer Library users to appropriate resources. Another 60% of those surveyed cited a need for specific knowledge about collections and information resources in departments other than their own. These findings are supported by those in the user survey. Many respondents to the open-ended question involving the helpfulness of Library staff indicated that staff sometimes gave wrong or incomplete information.

In the survey, degrees of unawareness could also be measured by high percentages of "don't know" answers, in response to a list of service points for which users might want more guidance.

Faculty, like other user groups, revealed a greater affinity to methods of accessing information which are traditional and thus, more familiar to them. Methods of access involving computers received relatively high rates of "don't know" answers. Although they were more familiar with using the MELVYL catalog than using any online bibliographic databases, 15% of those surveyed did not know if the MELVYL catalog was an effective method for accessing bibliographic information. Since half of the faculty already own a computer, and another quarter plan to own one in the next 5-10 years, the faculty will probably make greater use of computerized access methods if they are aware of them.

Graduates and undergraduates revealed this same tendency to rely on familiar or traditional methods of access. With the exception of the Science disciplines, these groups are generally unaware of the potential of computerized methods of information access. As is true of the faculty, the students, especially graduates, are expected to have more access and ownership of computers in the future.

Users evaluated their own needs for information about various library services. Again, they felt comfortable in their ability to utilize the familiar. Faculty expressed an interest in obtaining more information on using the MELVYL catalog, and learning more about the availability of reference materials in their discipline. Graduates wanted information on the availability of reference materials in their fields, how to find articles in magazines and journals, and how to use the online catalog. Undergraduates were most interested in obtaining general information about the library, how to access serials articles, and the availability of reference materials in their discipline.

In conjunction with the Task Force on Access to Information, this Task Force was able to identify sources of access to library resources through a list of Library collections and their sources of access. The list revealed limited access to

some of these collections. While the card catalog and serials lists are the primary tools of access for all users, they do not provide complete information for all of the Library's holdings. In many cases access to collections and resources is confined to the holding department. Specialized collections usually are not cross referenced in the card catalog and serials list. Some materials in Government Publications and Map and Imagery are not cataloged at all. This requires the users to venture to each service point to find the desired resources through their individual access sources. But first, the users must know that these service points exist. Many of our users, dependent on the card catalog and serials list, will never find these collections unless by chance, through word of mouth, or by virtue of an exploratory attitude towards library use.

Survey results have indicated a preference by our library users for direct methods of access to information and resources. They are unlikely to venture outside this preference to seek information that is not readily available.

The Task Force attempted to measure the effectiveness of signage as an awareness tool. Many survey respondents cited a need for improved quality and greater quantity of signs throughout the Library, including maps and directories.

The Sign Committee formed two years ago lacks organization and coordination. Its original membership of three has since dropped to two and no replacement has been appointed. This committee appears to no longer be active, but the need for improved signage still exists.

According to Library users and staff there exists an obvious need for a revitalized and coordinated program of promoting Library services and resources in order to better meet the needs of our users.

Awareness of Library resources and services directly relates to the education of our users. Promoting awareness is in itself a form of education. The Task Force recognizes the inherent inter-relationship between the concepts of awareness and education. The recommendations that follow in the proposed reorganization of promotional activities provide the foundation from which will grow a better informed and better educated clientele.

OPTIMAL SCENARIO/RECOMMENDATIONS

1. that the Library establish a first floor information center near the front entrance, equipped with promotional tools from each service department, in a variety of formats, from the printed to the electronic.

2. that awareness enhancement be constructed on a foundation of menus in published, audio/video media and computer formats.

3. that these menus provide different levels of sophistication, complexity, focus, and scope, and be targeted for various kinds of users.

4. that particular attention be given to promoting awareness in the following multidisciplinary areas which were frequently identified with low awareness in the survey responses: Special Collections, Interlibrary Loan, microforms, online searching, library instruction, and Government Publications. With an expected increase in areas of study which require information resources from a variety of disciplines, it is imperative that these interdisciplinary resources and services be promoted to raise the level of awareness, and thus the level of use, allowing for better informed library users.

5. that an expanded and comprehensive library guides publication program be planned and implemented, with emphasis on achieving multiple levels of complexity and detail in the publications. The various levels of complexity should be designed so that the simpler one leads to the more complex, customizing the information to the level of need. Undergraduates might be satisfied with the basic, while graduates and faculty might seek the more in depth. The publications program should be well supported. Publications must be updated to reflect growth in collections, changes in technology, etc. The writers of these publications should be given ample time and support to create a quality product. All publications should credit the compiler to promote pride of workmanship.

6. that Library publications include more subject-specific bibliographies and guides. These publications should adhere to these same levels of complexity as each subject requires. These publications will satisfy a need for direct access to the Library's resources and information.

7. that the Library establish a publications file and collect sample publications from other institutions on

a regular basis. This file could become a source of inspiration and ideas for designing publications of our own.

8. that the Library should provide a personnel resource directory for user consultation (i.e., names and location of librarians and support staff specialists). This idea contributes to a more personalized or humanized approach to information access.

9. that the Library's signage, floor directories and floor maps be redesigned for greater effectiveness. The Signage Committee should be revitialized to carry out this recommendation.

10. that menu-driven computerized video programs be provided in public areas to explain Library services in different levels of detail. Each program should link Library services with a Library employee whom the user might contact for further information (Personnel Resource Directory).

11. that promotion, awareness, and orientation materials be placed in student enrollment packets, particularly those of freshmen. Many survey respondents suggested this idea as a means of initial orientation to the Library. It would be an effective and unobtrusive means of reaching the entire student body.

12. that awareness presentations to classes in academic departments be highly specialized, and be coordinated with the faculty involved. Library users must perceive this information to be relevant to their academic program.

13. that subject-specific Library tours be offered to students. Graduate students stand to benefit most from this means of library orientation. Faculty support for this idea should be solicitied.

14. that the Library collaborate with the Student Activities Planning Committee to promote awareness of Library programs.

15. that the Library use campus publications (i.e., Nexus and Campus) to promote awareness of Library services and resources. These could highlight special acquisitions such as Landsat imagery or special research projects utilizing Library resources.

16. that the Library use KCSB to advertise special Library events (i.e., Corle Book Collection Contest, Friends of the Library book sales, Special Exhibits, and user seminars). Radio spots have the potential to reach

listeners outside the boundaries of the University campus.

17. that the Coordinator of Instructional Services be responsible for coordinating awareness and promotion activities. Because of the inherent interrelationship between awareness and education, the Coordinator and the Committee of Instructional Services can oversee a program of awareness promotion as a foundation from which the user education program can function more effectively.

Appendix I

TASK FORCE ON USER NEEDS AND EDUCATION ACTION PLAN

I. TASK FORCE CHARGE (elements in priority order)

A. Description of our Present and Future User Population and Identification of Its Needs

1. Identify the Library's constituency, specifying those groups which the Library has the greatest responsibility to serve.

2. Describe these groups in terms of academic status, broad discipline, frequency of use, and types of information sought.

3. Determine staff perception of the information services needed by these groups as well as staff perception of the relative importance among the information services to the groups.

4. Determine the primary constituency's perception of the relative importance among the information services to their needs.

5. Describe the constituency that the Library will be serving 5 to 10 years from now and identify the information services that they will need.

B. User Satisfaction with Current Services and the Identification of Additional User Services Appropriate to the Library's Role in the Future

1. Determine what information services the Library's primary constitutency is satisfied and dissatisfied with, and why.

2. Determine the primary constituency's perception of additional information services needed for the present and future.

3. Determine staff perception of additional information services needed for the present and future.

C. Role and Program Configuration of User Education in the Future

1. Determine what basic skills the UCSB Library constituency should have to make effective use of the Library.

2. Identify the types of library guidance and education that the groups currently need.

3. Assess current library guidance and education programs, describing strong and weak points.

4. Identify the types of library guidance and education that will be needed 5 to 10 years from now.

D. Methods for Increasing Awareness of Library Programs

1. Assess the present methods used to promote the Library's information services.

2. Assess the present level of awareness of information services among the Library's primary constituency.

3. Identify methods for increasing awareness of information services within the Library's primary constituency.

II. METHODOLOGY

A. Description of our Present and Future User Population and Identification of Its Needs

1. Through group discussion the task force will identify primary and secondary groups within the Library's constituency. The task force will refer to information gathered in the Phase I Report as well as the Master Plan and Salmon Plan regarding the make-up of the UC and UCSB constituency.

2. A short questionnaire (less than 25 questions) will be mailed to a random sampling of the primary groups. The groups will be segmented by status at the time of distribution and the different segments may be given different questions. The task force will work closely with Dick Berk, Director of the Social Process Research Institute, to develop the questionnaire, to input data into the microcomputer, and to analyze results. Monetary incentives will be considered to increase questionnaire response. In coordination with the AUL-Services and various Department Heads, types of requests for information and information services will be identified and tallied at key service points during selected weeks of the Fall quarter. The concept of market segmentation will be applied to the results of the questionnaire and data from other sources in order to determine and characterize what is distinctive about the

information needs of each group and the way they use the Library. Due to time constraints, only the primary groups within the Library's constituency will be surveyed.

3. A questionnaire will be administered to staff to survey their perceptions of the information needs of the Library's constituency. The task force will work with Dick Berk as in II A-2.

4. Same questionnaire as in II A-2. Comments from the Suggestion Box may be considered in the analysis.

5. Based on information gathered in steps 1-4, the task force will project the future constituency and its needs for information services.

B. User Satisfaction with Current Services and the Identification of Additional User Services Appropriate to the Library's Role in the Future

1. Same questionnaire as in II A-2. In addition, the task force will analyze ESCI Survey statistics for Interdisciplinary Studies 1 (Library Skills course) to evaluate clientele satisfaction.

2. Same questionnaire as in II A-2. Through a display of data from the survey and further group discussion, the task force will suggest a framework for evaluating, on an on-going basis, the Library's ability to meet the information needs of its constituency.

3. Same questionnaire as in II A-3. Interviews with selected staff may be utilized.

C. Role and Program Configuration of User Education in the Future

1. Through task force group discussion, and through interviews with those connected with current library instruction, the basic skills for effective library use will be determined.

2. Same questionnaire as in II A-3, along with the interviews with those connected with the current library instruction program.

3. Review and analyze library instruction programs and activities currently employed. Same method as II C-2. In addition, analyze ESCI Survey statistics to evaluate library skills courses.

4. Same method as II C-2.

D. Methods for Increasing Awareness of Library Programs

1. Gather and inventory types of publications used to promote information services. Inventory promotional methods available to UCSB such as departmental newsletters, alumni publications, and other campus media. Review and analyze these promotional resources through task force group discussion.

2. Same questionnaire as in II A-2, with the faculty group targeted on this element.

3. Same questionnaire as in II A-2 as well as group discussion.

Appendix II

USER SURVEY RESPONSE RATE

	POPULATION FALL '85		SURVEYS SENT		SURVEYS RETURNED			
	No.	a	No.	b	No.	c	d	e
Undergraduates								
Humanities	2740	18			61		16	2
Social Science	4815	32			148		38	3
Science	4065	27			120		30	3
Undeclared	3657	24			65		16	2
Did not indicate					3		1	
TOTAL*	15,277	100	1068	7	397	37	100	3
Graduates								
Humanities	392	18			87		16	22
Social Science	857	40			218		40	25
Science	889	41			239		44	27
Did not indicate					6		1	
TOTAL*	2138	100	918	43	550	60	100	26
Faculty (f)								
Humanities	357	44			128		33	36
Social Science	236	29			124		32	53
Science	226	28			128		33	57
Did not indicate					8			
TOTAL*	819	100	819	100	388	47	100	47

(a) % by broad discipline
(b) % of population
(c) % of surveys sent
(d) % within group
(e) broad discipline as % of total population
(f) Professors and visiting lecturers. Total number of visiting lecturers known but number by broad discipline extrapolated.

* Rounded percentages do not equal 100%

Appendix III

STATISTICAL TERMINOLOGY

PERCENTAGES, FRACTIONS, AND MEANINGS

Percentage Range	Simple Fraction	Size of a Group
1-10	One-tenth	Negligible Very few A handful
11-20	One-fifth	Small Few
21-30	One-fourth A quarter Three-tenths	Minority
31-40	One-third Two-fifths	Large minority Plurality (if true)
41-49	Nearly half	Very large minority Large Plurality (if true)
50	Half One out of two	Evenly divided (if close to 50-50)
51-60	More than half Three-fifths	Majority Most people
61-70	Two-thirds Seven-tenths	Large majority Substantial Considerable
71-80	Three-fourths Four-fifths	Very large majority Great
81-90	Nine-tenths	Overwhelming Very Great
91-99	More than nine out of ten	Nearly everyone Almost all

Charles Backstrom, Survey Research. NY: John Wiley, 1963

Appendix IV

Number of Searches : BRS, DIALOG, NLM

Patron-Status Comparisons: Faculty, Graduate, and Undergraduates

Percent Increases & Decreases in Numbers of Searches
Since FY80-81 and From Each Previous Fiscal Year

PATRON STATUS	FISCAL YEAR 80-81	81-82	82-83	83-84	84-85
FACULTY	123	129	192	125	94
(patron paid)	PP=59%	PP=54% PFY=+5	PP=64% PFY=+49 FFY=+56	PP=48% PFY=-35 FFY=+2	PP=52% PFY=-25 FFY=-24
GRADUATE	158	148	153	184	108
(patron paid)	PP=55%	PP=46% PFY=-9	PP=53% PFY=+7 FFY=-3	PP=49% PFY=+20 FFY=+16	PP=42% PFY=-41 FFY=-32
UNDERGRAD	81	35	53	43	30
(patron paid)	PP=32%	PP=20% PFY=-57	PP=19% PFY=+51 FFY=-35	PP=18% PFY=-19 FFY=-47	PP=18% PFY=-30 FFY=-63
OTHER	21	35	79	101	47
(ready ref)	RR=28%	RR=29% PFY=+67	RR=45% PFY=+126 FFY=+276	RR=37% PFY=+28 FFY=+381	RR=24% PFY=-53 FFY=+124

NOTE: Faculty, Graduate, and Undergraduate patron-status categories are for patron-paid searches only. The "Other" category is for ready-reference searches only.

The above abbreviations have the following meanings:

PP Percent of searches which were patron-paid during a given FY
PFY Percent change from the previous FY
FFY Percent change from the first FY (80-81)
RR Percent of searches which were ready-ref during a given FY--used only for the "Other" category.

EXPLANATIONS:

1. The numbers for FY80-81 have been extrapolated from incomplete data. Eight of the 12 months' data are complete.
2. Read each square as follows. Use FY84-85 for Faculty as an example :
   A. 52% of the searches done for faculty during FY84-85 were patron-paid. Therefore, 48% were ready-ref; but ready-ref data are not shown except for the "Other" category.
   B. The 52% represents a 25% decrease in the number of patron-paid faculty searches from the previous FY 83-84.
   C. There was also a 24% decrease in the number of patron-paid faculty searches since the first FY 80-81.
3. For the "Other" category for example, FY84-85, 24% of the searches were ready-ref. This represents a 53% decrease from the previous FY 83-84 and a 124% increase since the first FY 80-81.
4. Librarians and Library Staff have been excluded.

Source: Al Kirchmar, UCSB Online Search Statistics

Appendix V

INTERNAL AND EXTERNAL RESOURCE PERSONS INTERVIEWED AND CONTACTED BY USER EDUCATION SUBGROUP

A. Internal:

Joseph Boissé, University Librarian
Susan Bower, Arts Library (Music)
Larry Carver, Head, Map & Imagery Lab
Patricia Cronshaw, Head, Serials Dept.
Patricia Gebhard, Reference Dept.
Carol Beth Gibbens, Acting Head, Reference Dept.
Salvador Guerena, Chicano Studies
Cecily Johns, Associate University Librarian, Services
Lynette Korenic, Arts Library
Gary Peete, Government Publications
Robert Sivers, Science and Engineering Library
Audrey Thompson, Science and Engineering Library

B. External:

Ellen Broidy, Coordinator of Library Education Services, (UC-Irvine)
May Brottman, Past President of the ALA Library Instruction Round Table
Lucille Brown, State University of New York
Mark Ferrer, Director, Program of Intensive English (UCSB)
Regina Fletcher, Academic Advisor, College of Letters and Science (UCSB)
Bonnie Gratch, Head/Coordinator of Reference, Bowling Green State University
Susan Gynne, Women's Center (UCSB)
James Hart, Reference/Bibliographic Services, University of Cincinnati
Randall Hensley, Coordinator of User Education, University of Washington
Eddy Hogan, Reference Librarian, (UC-Berkeley)
Irene Hurlbert, Reference Librarian, (UC-San Diego)
Hymon Johnson, Assistant Director, Educational Opportunity Program (UCSB)
Richard Johnson, Instructional Consultant, (UCSB)
Elliot Kanter, Reference Librarian, (UCSD)
Rhonda Levine, Instructor, Program of Intensive English (UCSB)
Anne Lipow, Library Education Officer, (UC-Berkeley)
Arcadio Morales, Learning Skills Counselor, Center for Academic Skills Enrichment, (UCSB)
Perry Robinson, Cluster Undergraduate Library, (UC-San Diego)

Ilene Rockman, Associate Librarian, California Polytechnic State University, San Luis Obispo

Sandra Ready, Coordinator of Instructional Services, Mankato State University

Alan Ritch, Coordinator of Library Instruction, (UC-Santa Cruz)

David Russell, Oral Historian, UCSB Library, Oral History Program.

Appendix VI

USER EDUCATION INTERVIEW QUESTIONS

1. How important is user education/library instruction in an academic research library?

2. Identify the key factors that you think will shape the role and program configuration of user education at the UCSB Library.

3. Describe an ideal user education program for the UCSB Library.

4. What library skills and/or research concepts should be assertively emphasized in your ideal program?

5. For each skill or concept mentioned, what kind and level of instruction do you think is best for reaching the greatest number of users and potential users?

6. How would you implement your ideal user education program?

7. What changes in the Library's existing program would be necessitated by the implementation of your ideal program of user education?

8. How would these changes improve the quality of the UCSB Library's public services?

Appendix VII

COURSE-RELATED INSTRUCTION

The following is a partial list of courses in which librarians gave one or more lectures during the past two years.

Biology 96, Supervised Independent Laboratory Experience.
Biology 139, Cell Structure and Function.
Biology 142, Marine Microbiology.
Biology 151, Protosynthesis and Primary Productivity.
Black Studies 1A, Introduction to the Cultures and Peoples of African Heritage: The United States of America.
Classics 201, Proseminar (Bibliographic Orientation).
Communication Studies 88, Interpreting Communication Research.
Dramatic Art 200, Introduction to Graduate Studies in Dramatic Art.
Economics 136, Intermediate Accounting.
Education 200, Research Methods in Education.
Education 224, Practicum in Developmental Research.
Education 247B, Advanced Seminar in Administrator Behavior and Effect.
Education 253B, Interactive Technology in Education.
Education 258A, Seminar in Curriculum : Reading.
Education 265, Fieldwork in Counseling and Concurrent Seminar.
Education 391D, Procedures, Curriculum, and Instructional Materials Used in Teaching of Reading and Language Arts in Elementary Schools.
Electrical and Computer Engineering 594Q, Special Topics in Electrical and Computer Engineering.
English 1, Introduction to College Composition.
English 2A-B, First Year Reading and Composition.
English 42, Practice in Writing.
English 106, Writing of Nonfictional Prose.
English 200, Methods of Literary Study.
English 237, Studies in Genres, Themes, Approaches.
Environmental Studies 197A, Senior Thesis.
French 178, French Film : Theory and Practice.
French 205, Bibliography and Research Techniques.
Geography 3, Physical Geography.
Geography 115, Geographic Photo Interpretation.
Geography 118B, Production Cartography.
Geography 200A, Introduction to Geographic Research.
Geography 216I, Remote Sensing Instrumentation.
Geology 104A, Field Studies in Geologic Methods.
German 201, Bibliography and Methods of Criticism.
History 6, Introduction to History.

History 195, The Methods of History (American History Seminar).
History 208, Problems of Historical Preservation.
History 217A, Colloquium in Cultural Resource Management.
Music 180, Studies in Renaissance Music.
Music 200 A-B, Bibliography and Research Techniques.
Music 595, Group Studies.
Natural Science 1C, Contemporary Natural Science--Biology.
Political Science 3, Introduction to Public Policy.
Political Science 12, American Government and Politics.
Political Science 115, Law in the Modern State.
Political Science 155, American Legislatures.
Psychology 114L, Laboratory in Personality.
Psychology 133A, Psychopharmacology.
Psychology 195Q, Group Research in Psychopharmacology.
Psychology 210, Teaching and Communication Skills in Psychology.
Sociology 196, Honors Research Seminar in Sociology.
Zoology 143L, Laboratory in Ecological Physiology.

APPENDIX VIII

RESPONSE TO OPEN-ENDED QUESTIONS - USER SURVEY

I. UNDERGRADUATES

A. Humanities and Undeclared Undergraduates

Of the 129 undergraduates in the Humanities surveyed, 46 expressed dissatisfaction with Library services. Sixteen students complained specifically that the librarians at the Main and SEL reference desks were rude, unhelpful, and/or incompetent to help them. Four students claimed that reference desk staff refused to assist them or to explain the Library's services. Only four out of the 28 comments on helpfulness of the Library staff were positive; 24 responses were very negative. The Library staff is perceived by these students to be "unknowledgeable, unapproachable, stuffy, not well-informed, lacking patience, sometimes intimidating, inconsistent, and sometimes short, curt, and rude".

Twenty-two users responded that the Library staff was either not present or not available when they needed help or that the staff seemed unwilling to help them. Several students complained of having to wait too long for assistance and two students voiced a need for "more people working at once so all students could be served" and for "enough staff to answer all the questions".

Another major dissatisfaction was that there is little or no assistance in the use of the MELVYL catalog. Many students said that they would either like to have an online catalog with only UCSB holdings in it, or that they would like to see all of UCSB's holdings put into the MELVYL catalog. Many students voiced a strong desire for more MELVYL terminals, both inside and outside the Library, and for all kinds of instruction in the use of the MELVYL catalog including "MELVYL instruction seminars like at UCI", subject-focused user guides and brochures, and group and individual demonstrations by the Library staff.

There were a few excellent suggestions for increasing awareness and ability to use the Library. These included more and better signage, tours given for specific areas of the Library, instructional aids for all the equipment available, more staff available as guides and assistants during the day's busy hours, locational charts, handbooks on how to use the Library, more orientation and Library tours, and ways to increase student self-motivation.

Users would like microcomputers, word processors, new and better copy machines, viewing rooms with VCRs, electric typewriters, remote work-station access to the MELVYL catalog, and printers for the MELVYL terminals.

There were 73 responses regarding improvements to existing services. The responses covered a broad spectrum of ideas. There were numerous requests to "put all of the UCSB books into MELVYL" and to provide more MELVYL terminals throughout the Library. Several students mentioned the need to "make the students more aware of what Library services are available to them". They want the Library to provide more information on how to use the services and how to get at information as easily as possible. A recurring theme was that these users want to be provided with quick and easy access to books, serials, journal articles, research topics, and other Library resources and services. They also want services and instruction that will save their time.

There was a wide variety of suggested changes and improvements in the Library's services. Many of the comments were concerned with increasing and improving user-interaction with the public services librarians. These undergraduates want "more personal help". They want the librarians to be "more visible, more helpful, more knowledgeable and better-informed, more pleasant, more useful, and more willing to assist and instruct them in how to find and obtain needed information."

Some of the major findings which emerged from an analysis of this group of users are:

1. Users have fairly strong and growing expectations for information services. They are definitely interested in the current and future technology and want to make increasing use of it to satisfy their information needs.

2. These students are very critical of the reference staff's poor service-attitude, lack of approachability, and unwillingness to help them in attaining their information needs. There seems to be, among many of these undergraduates, a lack of confidence in the competency and willingness of the staff to assist them.

3. Many of these students have never used the Library (except possibly to study) and are unaware of the Library's information resources and services. They are definitely interested in knowing about these services and in making use of them. They would like the Library to vigorously advertise and promote the services that are available.

4. These users are very concerned with the problems of accessing the information they need. They are specifically concerned with the difficulties of bibliographic access to

books, journal articles, special collections, and reference works. Several users voiced their desire for more, better, quicker, and easier access to information in the Library's resources.

5. The users are very interested in automated access to information. Their most vociferous request is for an online catalog that contains all and only UCSB holdings and which shows the circulation status of our own materials.

6. These users are interested in improving the Library as a study facility. They want more study space, carrels, desks, etc. They want newer and more efficient copy machines, typewriters, word processors, microcomputers, microfilm viewers, etc. to aid them in their studies. They are very interested in having and maintaining quiet and comfortable areas for studying.

7. There were responses to nearly every open-ended question in this group of surveys which indicate a strong desire for all kinds of library instruction and user education which would help these students meet their information needs at all levels. These students definitely see a need for individual and group assistance and instruction in how to use the MELVYL catalog effectively, how to conduct subject-focused research, how to locate information in journals and periodicals and newspapers, how to conduct research and write research papers, ways of being made aware of the Library's resources and services (as needed), how to locate information quickly and easily using the appropriate access tools, how information is organized in the Library, where and when to seek help from the Library staff, and how to make use of the Library's facilities and services for study and research.

B. Social Science Undergraduates

Social Science undergraduates responded to the open-ended questions similarly to other disciplines, focusing on the key points of staffing, information processing equipment, study space, access tools and better guidance.

While there was general satisfaction with service, criticism pointed to some instances of rude, unenthusiastic or unknowledgable assistance at service desks, (especially the Reference/Information Desk, but also Government Publications, Science and Engineering Reference, and Card Catalog Assistance). Unavailability of staff at the Reference/ Information Desk, Card Catalog Assistance, and the Serials Desk was also mentioned, especially during evening hours.

Social Science majors had several suggestions for reinstating the typing room and providing word processors or electric typewriters. Several complaints involved the poor quality of the copy machines and the lack of a sufficient number.

At least 50 comments pointed to a need for more study space. Again, comfort in studying at the library is important, (i.e., less noise, later hours, better lighting and cleaner facilities). As the Reserve Book Room is used frequently for studying, the students wanted later hours and more copies of reserved materials.

These students, too, were dissatisfied with the MELVYL catalog citing its frequent breakdowns as well as a need for better instruction, personalized assistance in its use, and more terminals.

Requests for guidance and education focused on a need for a complete directory of Library services, Library information in registration packets, and required courses for freshmen. Personalized assistance as well as written or posted information is also desired. Other suggestions included a coordinated program with the Activities Planning Committee (APC) to inform students about Library services, a Library hotline, and a need for better Library promotion during the orientation period. They seem to recognize the need for library education at the beginning of their encounter with the University. Suggestions to improve IS 1 and 100 included making them more interesting, more relevant, and aimed at subject-specific research courses. Areas needing specific guidance included interest in Special Collections, Arts Library, and the use of Technical Reports.

C. Science Undergraduates

The Science undergraduates' dissatisfaction with the Library focused primarily on encounters with Library staff, equipment, and technology.

Several respondents cited rude or uncooperative assistance, unknowledgable workers, and limited availability of staff. Service points mentioned most frequently included Reference/Information Desk, Serials Desk, card catalog assistance, and assistance in using the MELVYL catalog. Many felt that they were not provided with the thorough information they needed. One respondent suggested that a librarian be hired to work specifically on helping with research projects.

Science undergraduates commented frequently on computers, specifically the MELVYL catalog. Clearly, there is a

frustration with its limitations, slowness, and frequent breakdowns. Some respondents suggested better written explanations for the use of the MELVYL catalog. Others suggested putting online: access to collections; serials and newspaper articles cited by subject and title; general campus information, including current campus events; a zip code directory; and a map that graphically locates materials on the shelves. Providing more terminals for the MELVYL catalog, printers for the MELVYL catalog and the 4th floor terminal lab, word processors, and Macintosh PC's were other ideas.

Students suggested, as methods of increasing awareness or guidance, mandatory library skills courses for undergraduates, written guides geared to undergraduate needs, registration packet supplements describing the Library's services, workshop series, and more posted information. They want to be able to learn what the Library has to offer by reading about it. They also recognize that they need library skills when they first enter the University .

Science undergraduates rely on current journal articles for information but need more guidance in accessing them, including the use of the Science Citation Index. Students, especially those in Computer Science, wanted more up-to-date information.

Many students asked for more and better quality copy machines, a reinstated typing room, and a reduction of the noise level.

More study space, more desks and later Library hours for studying were also requested. Anything that would make the Library more comfortable for studying, from better lighting, consistent room temperatures, to comfortable seating would please these undergraduates whose primary use of the Library is as a study hall.

II. GRADUATES

A. Humanities Graduates

Ninety-four graduate students in the Humanities responded to the survey. Graduates were dissatisfied primarily with ILL, Reserve Book Service, Reference/Information Desk, and the MELVYL catalog. ILL service was considered too slow. RBS loans were not long enough and penalties were too severe. Reference service was characterized as "indifferent, unhelpful, and uninformed." The greatest complaint about the MELVYL catalog was that it was incomplete and too slow. Complaints involving the Music Desk included a

dissatisfaction with time-consuming procedures and some unhelpfulness or unavailability of staff. The lack of bar codes on many music books caused delays in checking out materials. The lack of cataloged music cassettes made it difficult to find this material. Complaints leveled at the Curriculum Lab and Cataloging all had to do with slow or clumsy procedures. Some felt that there were gaps in the collection.

Graduates wanted an increase in instruction and education as well as an expansion of all forms of library technology. The MELVYL catalog was cited repeatedly with negative comments out-weighing the positive ones. Students expressed a desire for more guidance and broad information on collections, hours, and services, as well as specific indepth training related to the library tools in their fields.

Students generally felt the staff was helpful, although a few questioned staff expertise in their field. Availability of staff was perceived as a problem.

In general, Humanities graduate students expressed a desire for improved existing services by having longer hours in all departments, more staff, more and better technology, more quiet study space, and a collection which meets all their needs.

B. Social Science Graduates

For the most part, Social Science graduates are satisfied with Library services. To many, however, the image of the Library is one of slow, rude, and uniformed service. Generally, the remarks regarding the Reference/Information Desk centered on the unhelpful or condescending service, and the unwillingness of the librarians to directly show the users where a particular item is located. Several graduates criticized the reference librarians' habit of "pointing" in the direction of a reference tool. Many felt the Reference/Information Desk personnel had provided a great range of service, from the best to the worst. The loan periods of ILL and Reserve Book Service were seen as too restrictive. ILL was also seen as giving unpleasant and slow service.

Graduates wanted enhancements to be made to the circulation system to enable them to receive a list of books coming due. They also complained about the difficulty in recalling books. The Serials Service Desk was criticized for having unfriendly staff as well as rules that were too restrictive. Access to uncataloged materials was a problem.

The biggest area of complaint centered on the incompleteness of the MELVYL catalog.

Several students mentioned that there was too little return for their money with computer literature searches.

The Social Science graduates were most interested in orientation directed at the graduate level. They wanted orientation meetings with librarians responsible for their disciplines. They also called for better promotion of services, and for information to be sent directly to them.

A majority felt the staff was very helpful, although many expressed dissatisfaction with student assistants giving inaccurate information. Some noted difficulty finding librarians (especially above the 2nd floor) and many wanted to extend reference hours in the evenings and on Sundays. Night and weekend staff to fix copy machines was also wanted.

Graduates expressed a desire for graduate study areas, quiet study space, an increase in study space, and better temperature control in the Library.

Suggested areas for improvement (in priority order) included: 1) more timely access to materials, 2) the MELVYL catalog, and 3) more and better copy machines. Other improvements included more books and journals in the Social Science disciplines, remote access to the online catalog, public access to OCLC, personal computers, printers attached to the MELVYL catalog, more specialized, informed reference service, and a longer journal loan period for graduates.

C. Science Graduates

Science graduates were concerned with the collection (its contents and access to it), to some degree with the staff and its effectiveness and attitudes, and with copy machines.

They wanted readily available copy machines: they wanted more of them, of higher quality, kept in good repair. They would like reduction, enlargement, and assorted other capabilities on the machines. They wanted copiers in various locations. But most of all they wanted the machines available when they need them.

Science graduates wanted more monographs and journals and they wanted these to be current imprints and readily available. Hence, they asked for more copies, non-circulating copies, shorter loan periods for monographs, and longer loan periods for periodicals. They found bindery delays annoying.

They asked for remote access to information, particularly to the Library's holdings, circulation information, and serial indexes.

They found ILL slow and the staff unfriendly.

They wanted the Library to be open longer hours.

They found the MELVYL catalog too slow and incomplete and were frustrated by what they perceived to be inefficient search strategy.

III. FACULTY

A. Humanities Faculty

Faculty requested MELVYL catalog instruction, online database instruction, and instruction on how to access Library materials. The MELVYL catalog also received numerous complaints, mainly because it is not complete. Local as well as system-wide UC holdings were requested.

Staff attitudes were considered unhelpful and/or unfriendly in Interlibrary Loan, Circulation, Serials, and General Reference Desk/Information Desk. Faculty lodged additional complaints against policies in Reserve Book Service and Interlibrary Loan. Acquisitions and Cataloging were considered too slow and comments were received on slow response or no response to faculty requests to buy materials.

Concerning equipment and technology, faculty requested an expanded Arts Library with the Art Slide library and drama materials included to form a Fine Arts Library. Faculty requested remote access to the online catalog and document delivery as well as increased and expanded collections. Faculty also asked for reference room(s) in subject fields, 24-hour computer reference service, image banks of paintings, sculpture, illustrations, photographs, videotape collections with VCR's for viewing and analysis, subject access to Special Collections, and cataloging for the uncataloged collections.

Request for improvements in present services included more copiers, MELVYL printers, a separate room for microform materials with better microform machines, better response time from the MELVYL catalog, less computer breakdowns at the Circulation Desk, more efficient elevators, and returning to the printed college and university catalogs. Some faculty wanted to keep the card catalog and were

opposed to sending books and serials to the storage facility. Reserve Book Service was criticized because of problems in placing materials on reserve.

The faculty felt that more promotion of services are needed as well as better relations between the Library and the academic departments.

B. Social Science Faculty

The Social Science faculty is relatively satisfied with what exists, but wants more. Especially more acquisition of everything, and particularly research materials, of which serials seem the most urgent. They want materials to be acquired and cataloged sooner, librarians to be more responsive to their acquisitions recommendations, and to be informed when materials arrive. Some want to receive accessions lists in their subject fields.

They not only accept online catalogs, but want all catalogs to be online, complete, dependable, and accessible at their offices and homes. Most expect to use computers more in the future in connection with the Library. Many seem very frustrated with the MELVYL catalog not being complete, nor dependable, nor available at office or home, nor able to produce hard copy.

Many seem overwhelmed with the amount of information available, but seem to expect to become efficient in accessing it for themselves. Some feel that librarians are not knowledgeable nor expert in advanced library technology.

Most seem very satisfied with the conventional reference services, and with the reference librarians. Some would like more courtesy, and reference librarians available nights, weekends, holidays, and recesses.

Most feel that the subject/divisional libraries would meet their needs better than general service units. Government Publications received mixed reviews--more materials and self-access were wanted. Curriculum Lab received a couple of negative comments. Slavic, Oriental, and Black Studies were very positively received.

Crowding in the Library was noted, and more private study areas were desired. Some wanted longer hours, especially during recesses.

ILL got very negative comments--slow, ineffective, and unfriendly.

The faculty wanted more and better microform readers and copiers as well as more and better maintained copiers.

Reserve Book Service got very negative comments--they are essentially not promptly responsive to faculty needs.

Library instruction got mixed reviews, with the majority seeming indifferent.

Online database searching was very frustrating because it is not free, nor available at home and offices. Those that know about it like it very much.

Circulation services were perceived as too slow in everything; they wanted to know who has a book and whether it is on the shelf before they come to the Library. Some felt frustrated because too often materials are not on shelves.

In sum, they wanted the Library to acquire more research materials, to provide easier access to materials, and to provide a variety of Library services to them at their offices and homes.

C. Science Faculty

Science faculty were generally satisfied the present Library services, but several points of dissatisfaction were frequently expressed. The MELVYL online catalog system is incomplete (and therefore not very reliable) and there is a desire for more flexibility in search strategies. The RBS should be willing to put more books on reserve, and ILL is too slow to be very useful. Faculty circulation loan periods are too long and circulation records are often incorrect. Computer searches are too expensive, processing of books and journals is too slow, and the Library needs a Chemistry librarian.

Science faculty felt that student awareness of Library services and resources could be increased by required bibliographic instruction courses, library research assignments, computer-assisted learning and discussions with TA's, faculty and peers. The faculty felt their own awareness could be increased with MELVYL access from faculty offices, bibliographic searching on a P.C., and by having graduate students do research for them. The faculty expressed a need for more guidance in computer searching techniques.

With respect to Library equipment and technology, Science faculty wanted more and improved copy machines, computerized information searches, a complete online catalog with P.C. access, data searching from remote terminals and better searching strategies for the MELVYL catalog.

Looking to the future, Science faculty would like to see additional online Science bibliographic databases available (i.e., SPIRES, STAR, etc.), a new books bulletin via computer, an expanded document delivery service, additional journal titles and backfiles, and a decentralized Library network (i.e., a separate Science library). They envision a future where technology will play a greater role in their information access needs.

Appendix IX

RESPONSE TO OPEN-ENDED QUESTIONS - STAFF SURVEY

A. Comments: Academic Staff

Findings reinforced the value of tours and courses on library skills and library research. There is a need for a better way of administering the program, with a full-time user education coordinator. There is a need for instructors to be more knowledgeable and assertive in instruction, to improve the materials used and to work more closely with the faculty. Many also saw a need to make library instruction an academic requirement and to offer more course-related instruction.

They also felt that they need to improve their own skills in using the computer, online searching, and to keep up with changing technology. They saw the need for learning new methods and tools for instruction, as well as for keeping up with the more traditional subject expertise.

In terms of technology and equipment staff pointed out the need for training on RLIN, the MELVYL catalog, and database searching. They wanted to have reference desk access to the MELVYL catalog, RLIN, and OCLC. They felt that the Library's current video support equipment was not sufficient.

Course-related user instruction was considered to be the current major strength. Major weaknesses were considered to be attitudinal problems, rudeness, and lack of interest or knowledge on the part of instructors. The courses were not seen as being well coordinated and some of the material was seen as confusing. They felt there was a need for more interesting classes, presentation methods, instructional and promotional materials, MELVYL catalog training, and use of videos.

The academic staff wanted instruction on the use of online catalogs such as the MELVYL catalog, RLIN, ORION, and OCLC.

The academic staff felt that the faculty needed remote access to the MELVYL catalog and a UCSB online catalog, as well as microcomputer access to textual and numeric databases. They felt graduate students' needs were similar to faculty needs with the exception of free database searching. Undergraduates also needed an online catalog with remote access, more MELVYL terminals and training, media equipment, and more and better facilities for viewing video.

The academic staff also suggested intensive reference service by appointment to deal with more sophisticated user needs.

They felt that in the future users would need more computer-based information systems, and faster, more specialized service.

The academic staff saw an integrated reference collection manned with quality librarians as the single most important goal of the Library.

B. Comments: Classified Staff

Comments indicated that faculty and graduate students are only aware of services at the point-of-need. Graduate students are generally hesitant to use the MELVYL catalog since they don't understand it too well. Undergraduates are largely uninformed and need a great deal of help.

In order to increase awareness, course-related instruction is needed as well as more and better promotional material, such as information packets sent to academic departments and to all students.

Staff need for referral information and cross-training was seen as important for reference desk personnel, including student assistants.

Classified staff felt that the faculty needed seminars for up-to-date information on Library resources. As with academic staff, classified staff also indicated a need for mandatory library skills courses and indepth courses for graduates. They felt that the area where users needed the most instruction were Special Collections, Technical Reports, and MIL.

The staff felt that computer technology and information systems would have the greatest effect upon information needs in the future.

The staff pointed out the need for information service near the front door, improved attitudes among reference librarians, better copiers, and faster processing of Library material.

Appendix X

UCSB LIBRARY PUBLICATIONS
Fall, 1985

1. ABCs of Filing in the Card Catalog, 1981, 4 pp., located in Reference Dept. Single-fold brochure designed to locate Library materials listed in card catalog by author, title and subject. Describes filing rules with examples given of author before title, word by word, articles (a, an, the), names, numbers, languages, punctuation, and subjects. Does not include shelf list filing rules or explanation of call numbers.

2. Adelante - A Guide to Library Research in Chicano Studies (with Andres Gutierrez of El Teatro Campesino), 1985, 1/2 hour video tape, located in CTN. Comprehensive video overview of CTN.

3. Alphabetic Listing of Instructional Materials and Miscellaneous Items, 1984, 16 pp., located in Curriculum Laboratory. Xeroxed listing of Curriculum Lab holdings of instructional materials and miscellaneous items, with stack locations.

4. Art Exhibition Catalog Collection, 1984, 8 pp., located in Arts Library. Booklet providing description of access to art exhibition catalogs, highlighting flexibility of computer in providing access through various indexes, i.e., subject, title of catalog, author and city. Provides samples of above indexes.

5. Bibliographic & Information Searches by Computer, 1983, 3 pp., located in SEL and Reference Departments. Singl e-fold brochure providing general overview of computer search services offered. Describes advantages, costs and how to request them through Reference, Government Publications, and SEL.

6. Black Studies Unit: Recent Acquisitions, 1983, 26 pp., located in Black Studies. Booklet format bibliography organized by subject. Apparently out-of-print.

7. Botany. Life Sciences Guide Series 3: A Literature Guide, 1978, 54 pp., located in SEL. Comprehensive guide in booklet format with table of contents. Provides listings of literature guides, bibliographies, indexes, abstracts, reviews, histories, dictionaries, encyclopedias, taxonomy and more. Provides call numbers, descriptions, etc.

8. Case Law, 1985, 20 pp., located in Government Publications and Reference Departments. Booklet guide to legal materials in UCSB Library. Not comprehensive, includes table of contents, explanations, bibliographic citations designed to assist users in locating court decisions.

9. Chemistry Literature Guide, 1974, 79 pp., located in SEL. This booklet must be consulted at SEL Reference Desk. It provides a guide to the Chemistry literature available in bibliographic format.

10. Chicano Studies 191 D, 1985, located in CTN and posted around campus when class is offered. Flyer advertising the Chicano Studies librarian's Documentary Research in Chicano Studies class. Brief description of items covered in class structure.

11. Chicanos: A Checklist of Current Acquisitions, 1972 plus, published bi-annually, located in CTN. Two-color booklet. Selective list of recent acquisitions in CTN, organized by subject in bibliographic format with call numbers. Updates item described below.

12. Chicanos: A Selective Guide to Materials in the UCSB Library, 1972, 83 pp., located in CTN. Precedes above list of acquisitions. Bibliographic format with call numbers, available as ERIC Ed 215 852.

13. Communication Studies: A Bibliography, 1983, 21 pp., located in Reference Department. Booklet, with table of contents. Selective guide to publications relating to communication studies, includes selections of dictionaries, handbooks, bibliographies, and anthologies.

14. Dia de los Muertos, An Illustrated Essay and Bibliography, 1983, 44 pp., located in CTN. Bookl et.

15. Document Delivery Letter, 1985, mailed to and posted at campus and Library departments. Letter announcing document delivery service on a trial basis.

16. Ergonomics. Life Science Guide Series 2: A Literature Guide, 1976, 32 pp., located in SEL. Booklet, part of Life Science Guide Series, same format as described in Botany: Life Science Guide Series 3, with focus on Ergonomics and Physical Education.

17. Find Your Information Fast by Computer, unknown date. Flyer posted in Reference and distributed around campus. Announces Library service of computerized files, computer searches.

18. French Literature Bibliography, 1974, 26 pp., located in Reference. Booklet of selected bibliographic sources in the UCSB Library. Table of contents. Organized by source format and historical period.

18. General Biological Sciences including Biochemistry and Biophysics, 1974, formerly located in SEL. Literature guide. Out-of-print and unavailable.

19. General Information for Academic Borrowers, 1982. Available as handout in Circulation and Reference Departments. Flyer describing borrowing policies for academic Library card holders.

20. General Information for Student Borrowers, 1984. Available as handout in Circulation and Reference Departments. Flyer describing borrowing policies for student Library card holders.

21. Geography Pathfinder for the UCSB Library, 1975, 52 pp., located in SEL. Booklet. Guide to literature in bibliographic format.

22. Guide to Art Nouveau Literature, 1972, 39 pp. Booklet. Available for small fee. Subject-oriented bibliography with table of contents, annotations, and call numbers.

23. Guide to Library Research in Chicano Studies, 1984, 39 pp., located in CTN. Two-color booklet describing CTN and its resources, to be used in conjunction with CTN video: Adelante. 1986 revised edition is forthcoming.

24. Guide to UCSB Music Library, 1982, 4 pp., located in Arts Library, Music Desk. Xeroxed brochure describing Music Library collections and resources.

25. How to Find Books/How to Find Magazine Articles, 1983, located in Reference Department. Two-sided flyer with basic instruction on how to find books and magazine articles.

26. Information For Community Borrowers, 1983, Available as handout in Circulation and Reference Departments. Flyer describing borrowing policies for community Library card holders.

27. Information Resources in the Sciences and Engineering: A Laboratory Workbook, 1981, located in SEL. Workbook to be used in conjunction with library instruction course.

28. Instructions for the Preparation and Submission of Theses and Dissertations, 1985, 13pp., located in Reference Department. Comprehensive booklet describing preparation of theses and dissertations including procedure of submission, style and format, with samples provided.

29. Interlibrary Loan, 1985, 4 pp., located in ILL and Reference. Single-fold brochure, describing ILL service, hours, and procedures for use.

30. Map & Imagery Laboratory - Servicing the Needs of a Diverse Research Community, 1981, located in MIL. Flyer. Provides general overview of collections and resources.

31. Map & Imagery Laboratory Slide-Sound Presentation, 1986. Available for use as orientation to MIL, in-house. Still in development.

32. Mexican Soldaderas and Workers During the Revolution: An Exhibition Catalog, 1979, 21 pp., located in CTN.

33. Music Reference Guide, 1982, 30 pp., located in Arts Library, Music Desk. Booklet with illustrations, table of contents. Selective bibliography of reference tools related to Music. Call numbers provided.

34. Replies to Patron Comments/Suggestions. Postings on bulletin board and individual replies sent.

35. Research Fronts Recent Publications: 1982-1984, located in SEL. Monthly bibliographic serial. Out-of-print. No longer available.

36. Save Research Time - Use the Technical Report Collection, 1973, 4 pp., located in SEL. Single-fold brochure describing technical reports and access to them.

37. Selected UCSB Library Resources For Teaching Mathematics in the Secondary Schools, 1985, located in Curriculum Lab. Informational packet listing Curriculum Lab holdings for items relating to the teaching of mathematics in secondary schools.

38. Serials List (How to Use), 1984, 4 pp., located in Reference Department. Single-fold flyer describing serials list, locations, examples provided in explanation.

39. Soundings, 1969-, located in Library. Serial publication describing UCSB Library Collections.

40. Study Space Poster, 1985. Posted around campus, used as advertisement in Nexus. Advertises additional study space on campus.

41. Style Guides, 1983, 23 pp., located in Reference Department. Booklet describing availability of style guides available to various disciplinary studies, and as an aid to writing term papers, journal articles, research papers, dissertations, and technical reports.

42. Third World Student and Counseling, 1978, 31 pp., located at CTN. Booklet. Bibliography of materials dealing with the counseling of third world and minority students.

43. UCSB Intercampus Bus, 1985, located at ILL and Reference Departments. Flyer describing intercampus bus service and policies, including schedule.

44. UCSB Library, 1985, located at Reference Desk. Single-fold brochure with list of departments and locations, brief description of library instruction, tours and collections.

45. UCSB Library Department of Special Collections, 1981, 7 pp., located in Special Collections and Reference Departments. Booklet with illustrations describing various archival collections within the department.

46. UCSB Library Guide, Oceanography, 1978, located in SEL. Booklet. Out-of-print bibliography of oceanographic resources.

47. UCSB Library Resources: Selected Instructional Materials for Elementary Schools, 1985, located in Curriculum Lab. Xeroxed pages of curriculum materials relating to instruction in elementary schools, with list of LC subject headings and classification codes.

48. Undergraduate and Graduate 1986 Book Collection Contests, 3 pp., located in Library. Announcement of annual book collection contest established by Edwin and Jean Corle.

49. Use of Library by Visiting and Community Readers, 1983, 5 pp., located in Circulation and Reference Departments. Two-fold brochure welcoming community users to Library. Information on Library hours, circulation policy, collections, and services is included.

50. Use the Author - Title Catalog, 1978, 4 pp., located in Reference. Single-fold brochure directing Library users from the author/title catalog to the book on the

shelf. Brief explanations on components of card catalog elements.

51. Use the Subject Catalog, 1985, 4 pp., located in Reference. Same format as above, explaining use of subject catalog.

52. User's Guide to the Melvyl Online Catalog, 1985, 6 pp., located in Reference. Brochure for use with MELVYL catalog. Instructon on use of basic commands.

53. A Walking Tour of the UCSB Library, 1985, 8 pp., located in Reference. Booklet designed to carry while walking through Library. Briefly describes services and resources.

54. Where Is It?, 1984, located in Reference Department and posted throughout Library. Lists LC subject codes, locations, and subjects covered.

55. William Wyles Collection, 1984, 4 pp., located in Special Collections and Reference Departments. Booklet with illustrations describing the William Wyles Collection in the department of Special Collections.

56. Your Library, 1985, 4 pp. Single-fold brochure with services and resources described in narrative format. Includes Library map.

57. Your Subject Is Art, 1971, 22 pp., located in Arts Library. Xeroxed listing of bibliographic information relating to reference sources in the Fine Arts. Out-of-print but in the process of being updated.

Appendix XI

SUMMARY TABULATION: COMMENTS/SUGGESTIONS
RECEIVED DURING THE PERIOD 10/83 - 8/85
UCSB LIBRARY

1.	Facilities: Hot/Cold; dirty; maintenance	40
2.	Noise	35
3.	Requests to acquire particular materials	35
4.	Appreciation of library, staff, services	23
5.	Not enough seating during finals and midterms	17
6.	Circulation policy/procedures complaints	13
7.	Food in Library: opposed	13
8.	Longer hours open especially during finals	9
9.	Closing announcement annoying	8
10.	Food in Library: desired	8
11.	Book returns: more; in more locations; empty more often	8
12.	Library furnishings: appreciation	8
13.	Microform readers: maintenance; replace; relocate	7
14.	Dictionaries: more needed	7
15.	Post more signs	6
16.	Copiers: More needed; maintenance	5
17.	Serials access problems	5
18.	RBS operations problems	5
19.	Typewriters: more; better; maintenance	5
20.	Fines: Too high; too rigid	5
21.	MELVYL: For	5
22.	Safety concerns	5
23.	Food monitors at door: opposed and for	4
24.	Card Catalog problems: misfiles; entries missing	4
25.	Newspapers: More needed; faster processing	4
26.	Open up faculty studies to all	4
27.	MELVYL: opposed	3
28.	Exhibits: Complaints and appreciation	3
29.	Replace pencil sharpeners	3
30.	Book sale operations complaints	3
31.	Replace light bulbs	3
32.	Lockers: more; hoarding books in; removal of books	2
33.	Shelving and reshelving policies	2
34.	More clocks	2
35.	Provide trade books	2
36.	Wasted energy: automatic doors, lights	2
37.	UCLA Bus problems	2
38.	Map & Imagery Laboratory Service	2
39.	Book mutilation abhorred	1
40.	Comments and responses appreciated	1
41.	Community borrowers want freer access	1
42.	More conference rooms wanted; or limit to consultation	1
43.	Library Decor	1
44.	Interlibrary Loan	1
45.	Message board maintenance	1
46.	Music facilities	1

47.	Close night study at night	1
48.	Patron paging on P.A. policies	1
49.	Moving materials to reshelving facility	1
50.	T.V. in library needed for recreation	1

USER EDUCATION/LIBRARY INSTRUCTION: A SELECTED BIBLIOGRAPHY

By Edward De Walt and Dennis Hamilton

American Library Association. ACRL, Bibliographic Instruction Section. Evaluating Bibliographic Instruction : A Handbook. Chicago, A.L.A., 1983.

Association of College and Research Libraries. Bibliographic Instruction Liaison Project. Integrating Libraries Into Higher Education. (Carolyn Kirkendall, Program Officer) Chicago, ACRL, s.d.

Association of College and Research Libraries. Bibliographic Instruction Section. Continuing Education Committee. Organizing and Managing a Library Instruction Program: Checklists. Chicago, ACRL, [1979]. Preconference, Southern Methodist University, June 21-23, 1979, Dallas, Texas.

Association of College and Research Libraries. Bibliographic Instruction Section. Policy and Planning Committee. Bibliographic Instruction Handbook. Chicago, A.L.A. 1979.

Association of Research Libraries. Office of Management Studies. Systems and Procedures Exchange Center. Bibliographic Instruction in ARL Libraries. Washington, D.C., ARL/OMS, February 1986. (ARL/OMS SPEC Kit no. 121).

Baker, Betsy and Nielsen, Brian. "Educating the Online Catalog User; Experiences and Plans at Northwestern University Library." Research Strategies, v.1, no.4 (Fall 1983), 155-66.

Blazek, Ron. "Effective Bibliographic Instruction Programs: A Comparison of Coordinators and Reference Heads in ARL Libraries." RQ, v.24, no.4 (Summer 1985), 433-441.

Bobay, Julie. Library Instruction Task Force: Report, April 9 1985 by Julie Bobay, Chair, Joanne Bailey, Emily Okada, Andrea Singer, David Warrington, and Alice Wickizer. Unpublished, Indiana University, Bloomington, 1985.

"The Library Instruction Task Force was appointed in September 1984 and charged with the development of a plan for library instruction activities for undergraduate students."

Boissé, Joseph A. "Administrative Point of View (Response to the Think Tank Recommendations on Bibliographic Instruction)". Journal of Academic Librarianship, v.9 (March 1983), 10-11.

Boissé, Joseph A. "Library Instruction Policy (Letter in Reply to J. N. Berry)." Library Journal, v.106 (Dec.15, 1981), 2342.

Borgman, Christine L. and others. "University Faculty Use of Computerized Databases: An Assessment of Needs and Resources." Online Review, v.9, no.4 (August 1985), 307-344.

Brassil, Ellen C. "User Education Column." Medical Reference Services Quarterly, v.1, no.1, (Spring 1982), 101-104.

Breivik, Patricia Senn. Planning the Library Instruction Program. Chicago: ALA, 1982.

> "...the activities of librarians become meaningless unless they actually effect changes in teaching and learning." (B. Lamar Johnson, 1948, p.IV)

Brittain, Michael and Irving, Ann. Trends in the Education of Users of Libraries and Information Services in the U.S.A. Loughborough University, Department of Library and Information Studies, 1976.

Broadus, Robert N. "Online Catalogs and Their Users." College and Research Libraries, v.44, no.6 (November 1983), 458-467.

Broidy, Ellen. "Library Instruction; Bibliographic Instruction: Some Sobering Thoughts on the 'How I Done it Good Syndrome'". California Library Association. CARL Newsletter, v.6, no.2 (May 1983), 3-4.

Bubb, John. "Another View of Reality: A Response to David Peele." Journal of Academic Librarianship, v.10, no.5 (November 1984), 271.
(Response to article by David Peele. "Librarians as Teachers").

Buckland, Michael K., and Boehm, Eric H., editors. Education for Information Management: Directions for the Future. Santa Barbara, International Academy at Santa Barbara, [c1983].
("Record of a Conference co-sponsored by the Information Institute, International Academy at Santa Barbara and the Association of American Library Schools, May 6-8, 1982")

California. University. Berkeley. General Library. Instructional Support Services of the General Library. Unpublished.
(Library Orientation Leaflet No.56)
U.C. Berkeley has Annual Library Updates for Faculty Titled "Library Update Seminars".

California. University. Berkeley. Library School. The MELVYL Online Catalog: A Self-paced Workbook. Unpublished.

California. University. Los Angeles. University Library. Library Instruction Task Group. Report of the Library Instruction Task Group to the University Librarian. Submitted by Hiram L. Davis, Chairperson, Elizabeth Eisenbach, Anthony Greco, Ann Hinckley, Gloria Werner. UCLA, Unpublished, 1977.

California. University. Santa Barbara. Office of Instructional Development. Main Item Pool: Evaluation System for Courses and Instruction (ESCI). Unpublished pamphlet. Santa Barbara, UCSB, 1980.

Caruso, Dorothy Elaine. An Experiment to Determine the Effectiveness of an Interactive Tutorial Program, Implemented on the Time Sharing IBM 360, Model 50, in Teaching a Subject-Oriented User to Formulate Inquiry Statements to a Computerized Online Information Retrieval System. Ph.D. Dissertation, University of Pittsburgh, 1969. [Ann Arbor, Michigan, Univ. Microfilms, Intl., 1977].

Changing Scholarship: the Challenge to Libraries. Association of Research Libraries, May 1982 meeting, Scottsdale. (Prepublication copies of papers by principal speakers--Ralph Cohen, William Hartmann, and Kenneth Prewitt). Unpublished.
Cohen, Ralph. "The Impact of Changes in Scholarship in the Humanities upon Research Libraries."
Hartmann, William K. "Patterns of Library use in the Physical Sciences."
Prewitt, Kenneth. " Social Science Research Council."

Cochrane, Pauline Atherton. Redesign of Catalogs and Indexes for Improved Online Subject Access: Selected Papers of Pauline A. Cochrane. [Phoenix, Ariz.], Oryx Press, 1985.

Cochrane, Pauline Atherton. "Subject Access in the Online Catalog." Research Libraries in OCLC, v.8, no.5 (January 1982), 1-7.

Coleman, Kathleen. "Library Instruction and the Advancement of Reference Service". In Katz, Willaim A., editor. Library Instruction and Reference Services, p. 241-252.

Conant, Ralph Wendell. The Conant Report: A Study of the Education of Librarians. Cambridge, Mass., MIT Press, [c1980]

Cook, Margaret G. The New Library Key. N.Y., H.W. Wilson Co., 1975. (3rd ed.)

Dawson, Patrick. Study of the MELVYL Online Catalog User's Guide. Santa Barbara, unpublished, 1985.

Dodd, Jane. "Free Online Searches for Undergraduates: A Research Project on Use, Costs, and Projections." Library Hi Tech, v.1, no.4 (Spring 1984), 43-50.

"Earlham College Still a Model for Course-integrated BI." College and Research Libraries News, v.46, no.6 : (June 1985), 295.

Engh, Mary Jane. Priorities in Academic Library Bibliographic Instruction: Lower Undergraduate versus Advanced Level. Mary Jane Engh and Carloyn Takeuchi. Research Strategies, v.1, no.4 (Fall 1983), 176-181.

Euster, Joanne R. "'Full of Sound and Fury, Signifying...'...What?" Journal of Academic Librarianship, v.9, no. 1 (March 1983), 13-14.
(Response is part of: "Reactions to the Think Tank Recommendations: A Symposium, " Joanne R. Euster, Symposium Editor.)

Euster, Joanne R. "Reactions to the Think Tank Recommendations: A Symposium." Journal of Academic Librarianship, v.9, no. 1 (March 1983), 4-14.
(Joanne R. Euster, Symposium Editor, 1981 ALA San Francisco Pre-conference, "Premises, Problems: Views and Approaches to Bibliographic Instruction.")

Farber, Evan I. "The Importance of Teaching Use of the Library." Library Issues, v.2, no.2 (November 1981), 2.

Frick, Elizabeth. "A Reasonable Proposition." Journal of Academic Librarianship, v.9, no. 1 (March 1983), 11-12.
(Response is in part of: "Reactions to the Think Tank Recommendations: A Symposium," Joanne R. Euster, Symposium Editor.)

Friend, L. "Independence at the Terminal: Training Student End Users to Do Online Literature Searching." Journal of Academic Librarianship, v.11 (July 1985), 136-141.

Galvin, Thomas J. and Lynch, Beverly P., editors. Priorities for Academic Libraries. San Francisco, Jossey-Bass, 1982. (New Directions for Higher Education, Martin Kramer, Editor-in-Chief.; no.39, 1982.)
(Priorities for Academic Libraries, X, no.3, September 1982)

Gratch, Bonnie. "Involving Classroom Faculty in the Reference Function." College and Research Libraries News, (February 1986), 125-127.

Guskin, Alan E. and others. "The Academic Library as a Teaching Library: A Role for the 1980's." Library Trends, Fall 1979, 281-296. Alan E. Guskin, Carla J. Stoffle, and Joseph A. Boisse.

Hamilton, Dennis. "Library Users and Online Systems: Suggested Objectives for Library Instruction." RQ, v.25, no. 2 (Winter 1985), 195-197.

Hamilton, Dennis. Loex Library Instruction Workshop. An unpublished paper on the theme ("Teaching the Online Catalog User") of the Second Biennial LOEX Workshop held at Eastern Michigan University on May 9 and 10, 1985.

Hamilton, Dennis. "Report on the ALA Preconference: 'Prospects for the Online Catalog'". Unpublished, Santa Barbara, 1982.

Hansen, Kathleen A. and Ward, Jean. "Journalism and Library Research: Combining Methodologies in a New Search Model." Research Strategies, v.1, no.4 (Fall 1983), 167-175.

Hart, James W. "The Library's Role in Fostering Computer Literacy." In Issues in Academic Libraries: Views and Case Studies for the 1980's and 1990's. Peter Spyers-Duran and Thomas W. Mann, Jr., editors. (Westport, Conn., Greenwood Press, 1985).

Huston, Mary. "Rethinking Our Approach for Research Instruction." Research Strategies, v.1, no.4 (Fall 1983), 185-187.

Jacobson, G. N. and Albright, M. J. "Motivation via Videotape: Key to Undergraduate Library Instruction in the Research Library." Journal of Academic Librarianship. v.9 (November 1983), 270-275.

Johnson, Eric W. "Library Instruction for Faculty Members." In Katz, William A., editor. Library Instruction and Reference Services, p. 199-204.

Johnson, Millard F., Jr. "After the Online Catalog: A Call for Active Librarianship." American Libraries, v.13, no.4 (April 1982), 235-239.

Jones, Ken H. Conflict and Change in Library Organizations: People, Power, and Service. London, Clive Bingley, [1984]. (Looking Forward in Librarianship).

Karpisek, Marian E. Making Self-Teaching Kits for Library Skills. Chicago, ALA, 1983.

Katz, William A. Introduction to Reference Work. (4th ed.) N.Y., McGraw Hill, 1982.

Katz, William A., editor. Library Instruction and Reference Services. New York, Haworth Press, 1984.
(Issue no. 10 of The Reference Librarian, Spring/Summer 1984).

Kenney, Donald J. "Where There Is No Vision." Journal of Academic Librarianship, v.9, no. 1 (March 1983), 7-8.
(Response is part of: "Reactions to the Think Tank Recommendations: A Symposium," Joanne R. Euster, Symposium Editor).

Kirk, Thomas G., editor. Increasing the Teaching Role of Academic Libraries. San Francisco, Jossey-Bass, c1984.
(New Directions for Teaching and Learning, no. 18, June 1984).

Kirkendall, C. A. "To Teach Manual or Online Searching?" Research Strategies. 3, (Spring 1985), 93-95.

Kline, Laura S. "Library Orientation Programs for Foreign Students: A Survey." RQ, v.24, no.2 (Winter 1984), 210-216.

Koyama, Janice T. "Bibliographic Instruction and the Role of the Academic Librarian." Journal of Academic Librarianship, v.9, no. 1 (March 1983), 12-13.
(Response is part of: "Reactions to the Think Tank Recommendations: A Symposium," Joanne R. Euster, Symposium Editor).

Librarians Association of the University of California--Santa Barbara. Report and Minority Report of LAUC Ad Hoc Committee on Library and Bibliographic Instruction. Susan Sonnet, Chairperson, LAUC-SB. Unpublished, 1976, Santa Barbara.

(Librarian's Association of the University of California, Santa Barbara Division. Memo 76-2).

Lewis, David W. "An Initial Reponse..." Journal of Academic Librarianship, v.9, no. 1 (March 1983), 4-6.
(Response is part of: "Reactions to the Think Tank Recommendations: A Symposium," Joanne R. Euster, Symposium Editor).

Lubans, John. "Library Literacy; Computers and User Education: A Misalliance." RQ, v.24, no.2 (Winter 1984), 135-137.

MacAdam, Barbara. "Humor in the Classroom: Implications for the Bibliographic Instruction Librarian." College and Research Libraries, v.46, no.4 (July 1985), 327-333.

McClintock, Marsha Hamilton, editor. Training Users of Online Public Access Catalogs. Washington, D.C., Council on Library Resources, 1983. Report of a conference on training users on online public access catalogs, held at San Antonio, Texas, January 12-14, 1983.

McCoy, W. Keith. "Real Reference Problem is Leadership." American Libraries, v.15, no. 7 (July/August 1984), 484-485.

McPherson, Dorothy. "How the MELVYL Catalog is Used: A Statistical Overview." DLA Bulletin, v.5, no.2 (August 1985), 16-18.

Main, Alex. Educational Staff Development. London, Croom Helm, [c1985]. (New Patterns of Learning)

Malley, Ian. The Basics of Information Skills Teaching. London, Clive Bingley, [1984]
While the book is aimed at the small library or information unit, it is also focused on the librarian with a wide range of responsibilities, and a limited amount of time and money in which to develop new services.

Matthews, Joseph R. "Online Public Access Catalogs : Assessing the Potential." Library Journal, v.107 (June 1, 1982), 1067-1071.
(Discussion: Library Journal, v.108 (Jan. 1, 1983), 2.

"MELVYL Catalog Projects Receive LAUC Research Grants." DLA Bulletin, v.5, no.2 : (August 1985), 4.

Michaels, Carolyn Leopold. Library Literacy Means Lifelong Learning. Metuchen, N.J., Scarecrow Press, 1985.

Miller, Mara. Where to Go For What: How to Research, Organize, and Present Your Ideas. Englewood Cliffs, N.J., Prentice-Hall, c1981.

Miller, William. "What's Wrong with Reference: Coping with Success and Failure at the Reference Desk." American Libraries, v.15, no.5 (May 1984), 303-306, 321-322.
(Discussion: See-McCoy, W. Keith. "Real Reference Problem is Leadership"._____, v.15, no.7 (July/August 1984), 484-485).

Moran, Barbara B., Academic Libraries: The Changing Knowledge Centers of Colleges and Universities. Washington, D.C., Association for the Study of Higher Education, 1984.
(ASHE-ERIC Higher Education Research Report no. 8, 1984).

Morehead, Joe. Theory and Practice in Library Education; The Teaching-Learning Process. Littleton, Colorado, Libraries Unlimited, 1980.
(Research Studies in Library Science, no.16).

Neway, Julie M. Information Specialist as Team Player in the Research Process. Westport, Conn., Greenwood Press, [c1985]. (New Directions in Librarianship, no.9)

Oberman-Soroka, Cerise. Petals Around a Rose : Abstract Reasoning and Bibliographic Instruction. Chicago, ACRL, s.d.

Pastine, Maureen. "Library Instruction and Reference Service: Administration of a Bibliographic Instruction Program in the Academic Library." In Katz, William A., editor. Library Instruction and Reference Services, 181-189.

Peele, David. "Librarians as Teachers : Some Reality, Mostly Myth." Journal of Academic Librarianship, v.10, no.5, (November 1984), 267-270.

Piele, Linda J. "Bibliographic Instruction : Reference Assistance Project at the University of Wisconsin-Parkside." College and Research Libraries News, no.3 (March 1982), 83-84.

Pratt, Allan D. "Microcomputers in Libraries." Annual Review of Information Science and Technology, v.19, 247-269.

Rahe, Robin and Bobay, Julie, compilers. IUB Libraries : Instruction and Orientation Activities, 1985. Unpublished, Indiana University, Bloomington, 1985.

Reichel, Mary. "Bibliographic Instruction and the Reference Desk." Journal of Academic Librarianship, v.9, no. 1 (March 1983), 9-10.
(Response is part of: "Reactions to the Think Tank Recommendations: A Symposium," Joanne R. Euster, Symposium Editor).

Renford, Beverly and Hendrickson, Linnea. Bibliographic Instruction : A Handbook. N.Y., Neal-Schuman, 1980.

Reynolds, Judy. "Academic Library Services : The Literature of Innovation." College and Research Libraries, v.46, no.5 (September 1985), 402-417.

Ritch, Alan. "Teaching MELVYL : A Research Study." DLA Bulletin, v.4, no.2 (October 1984), 4-7.

Robbins-Carter, Jane B. and others. "Reactions to 1985 to 1995 : The Next Decade in Academic Librarianship, Parts I and II." College and Research Libraries, v.46, no.4 (July 1985), 309-319. By Jane Robbins-Carter, Johannah Sherrer, Deborah Jakubs, and Charles B. Lowry.

Roberts, Anne F. "Training Reference Librarians Using Library Instruction Methods." In Katz, William A., Library Instruction and Reference Services, p. 67-74.

Rosenblum, Joseph. "The Shifty Shoals of Bibliographic Instruction." Journal of Academic Librarianship, v.9, no. 1 (March 1983), 8-9.
(Response is part of: "Reactions to the Think Tank Recommendations: A Symposium," Joanne R. Euster, Symposium Editor).

Ross, Judith B. "New Strategies : Product and the Behavioral Learning Theory." In Weingand, Darlene E., compiler. New Strategies : Marketing Public Library Services, ALA, 1984, p. 46-69.

Schaefer, Steve W. "Practicing Librarian : the Library as Lyceum." Library Journal, v.106 (April 15, 1981), 856-859.

Seaver, Alice R. Library Media Skills : Strategies for Instructing Primary Students. Littleton, Colo., Libraries Unlimited, 1984.
(Teaching Library Media Research and Information Skills Series.)

Segal, JoAn and Tyson, John. "The Library's Changing Role in Higher Education." Library Journal, v.110, no.15 (September 15, 1985), 44-46.

Senzig, Donna. "Library Catalogs for Library Users." RQ, v. 24 (Fall 1984), 37-42.

Sivers, Robert. Brief Comparison of MELVYL and Dialog. Unpublished, 1984-85.
From notes for lectures for Geography 200 A-B (Introduction to Geographic Research).

Smith, Judith M. Designing Instructional Tasks. New York, Academic Press, 1978. (A Technology of Reading and Writing, vol. 4).

Smith, Sean. The MELVYL Online Catalog : A Self-Paced Workbook. (unpublished). San Diego, UCSD, ?

Spyers-Duran, Peter, editor. Issues in Academic Libraries : Views and Case Studies for the 1980s and 1990s. Westport, Conn., Greenwood Press, [1985].
(New Directions in Librarianship, number 7).

Stevens, Norman D. "Computer Proficiency and Computer Access in the Library." Library Issues, v.6, no.1 (September 1985), 4.

Stoffle, Carla J. and Pryor, Judith M. "Competency-Based Education and Library Instruction." Library Trends, v.29, no. 1 (Summer 1980), 55-67.

Stoffle, Carla J. and others. "Teaching, Research and Service: The Academic Library's Role." By Carla J. Stoffle, Alan E. Guskin, and Joseph A. Boissé. In Kirk, Thomas G., editor. Increasing the Teaching Role of Academic Libraries, p. 3-14.

Tenopir, Carol. "Online Databases : In-House Training and Staff Development." Library Journal, v.109, no.8 (May 1, 1984), 870-871.

"Think Tank Recommendations for Bibliographic Instruction." College and Research Libraries News, v.42, no.11 (December 1981), 394-398.
(The Think Tank included Paula Walker, Carla Stoffle, Anne Roberts, Brian Nielsen, Donald Kenney, Francis Hopkins, and Joanne Euster, Facilitator).

Thomas, Joy. "The University Faculty and Library Instruction." RQ, v.23, no.4, (Summer 1984), 431-437.

Thurston, Charles. "BI Tip Sheet for Academic Administrators and Support Staff." College and Research Libraries News, v.45, no.10 (November 1984), 546-548.

Tuckett, Harold W. and Stoffle, Carla J. "Learning Theory and the Self-Reliant Library User." RQ, v.24, no.1, (Fall 1984), 58-66.

University of Arizona. Public Services in Research Libraries : Final Report From the Public Services Research Projects. Washington, D.C.; ARL/OMS, 1985.
An assessment of library instructional needs at the University of Arizona in a selected scientific discipline and the means to develop a more effective library instruction program.

University of California. Office of the Assistant Vice-President. Library Plans and Policies. Division of Library Automation. Introduction to the Pre-Test of the Prototype On-line Catalog. Berkeley, Calif., unpublished, April 1981.

University of Cincinnati. Central Library. Workbook for New Students; Reference Bibliographic Services. 1985-86 Revised Edition. (Unpublished.) Cincinnati, University of Cincinnati, c1983.
(Loose quiz with computer sheet enclosed, 12 loose pages)

University of Denver. Graduate School of Librarianship and Information Management. The Public Online Catalog Study . Denver, unpublished, 1982.
A Symposium sponsored by the Council on Library Resources, Inc.

Van Pulis, Noelle. "User Education for an Online Catalog : A Workshop Approach." RQ, v.21, no.1 (Fall 1981), 61-69.

Veaner, Allen B. "1985 to 1995 : The Next Decade in Academic Librarianship, Part I." College and Research Libraries, v.46, no.3 : (May 1985), 209-229.
Discussion: See Robbins-Carter, Jane B. "Reactions to 1985 to 1995: The Next Decade in Academic Librarianship, Parts I and II." _____, v. 46, no. 4 (July 1985), 309-319.

Veaner, Allen B. "1985 to 1995 : The Next Decade in Academic Librarianship, Part II." College and Research Libraries, v.46, no.4 (July 1985), 295-308.
Discussion: See Robbins-Carter, Jane B. "Reactions to 1985 to 1995: The Next Decade in Academic Librarianship, Parts I and II." _____v.46, no.4, (July 1985), 309-319.

Wagner, G. "Online Information Retrieval Instruction in Schools of Librarianship : The Problems and Some Solutions." LASIE, 15 (November/December 1984), 10-17.

Walsh, Patricia M. and Van der Giessen, Hans. Research in Practice Workbook. [Redding Ridge, CT.], Professional Services Publishing, [c1983].
A basic library skills workbook defined by area of the library : Card Catalog, Indexes, Periodicals, Microforms, Government Publications, Reference Sources, New Technology, Research Process, Research Paper.

Ward, S. N. "Course-integrated DIALOG Instruction." Research Strategies, 3 (Spring 1985), 52-64.

Weingand, Darlene E., compiler. Marketing Public Library Services: New Strategies. Chicago, A.L.A, 1985.
Proceedings of the Public Library Association Frontiers Conference, Madison, Wisconsin, August 17-23, 1984.

Williams, William Proctor. An Introduction to Bibliographical and Textual Studies. New York, Modern Language Association of America, 1985.

Williamson, Nancy J. "Is There a Catalog in Your Future? Access to Information in the Year 2006." Library Resources and Technical Services, v.26, no.2 (April/June 1982), 122-135.

Wolf, Carolyn E. Basic Library Skills : A Short Course. Jefferson, North Carolina, McFarland, 1981.

Zlotnick, Barbara Bradley. Ready for Reference : Media Skills for Intermediate Students. Littleton, Colo., Libraries Unlimited, 1984.

UCSB LIBRARY USER SURVEY (student)

What is your major at UCSB?_____

I. USE/AWARENESS

1. On the average, how often do you use the library?

a. for general reading (not course or research related)
( ) at least twice a week
( ) at least twice a month
( ) less than twice a month
( ) have never used

b. for browsing collections
( ) at least twice a week
( ) at least twice a month
( ) less than twice a month
( ) have never used

c. to study for courses using own materials
( ) at least twice a week
( ) at least twice a month
( ) less than twice a month
( ) have never used

d. to look up information to do class assignments
( ) at least twice a week
( ) at least twice a month
( ) less than twice a month
( ) have never used

e. to use material reserved for your courses
( ) at least twice a week
( ) at least twice a month
( ) less than twice a month
( ) have never used

f. to obtain information for research
( ) at least twice a week
( ) at least twice a month
( ) less than twice a month
( ) have never used

2. Please put a check mark indicating how often you use the following services. IN ADDITION indicate your satisfaction or dissatisfaction with those services you USE. (check all categories that apply).

	at least twice a week	at least twice a month	less than twice a month	aware of but don't use	unaware of	satisfied	dissatisfied
Reference/Information Assistance							
Interlibrary Loan							
Reserve Book Service							
Circulation Service (check-out, recalls)							
Government Publications							
Arts Library Reference							
Art Exhibition Catalog Reference							
Music Service Desk/ Listening Facilities							
Science and Engineering Reference							
Technical Reports Assistance							
Map and Imagery Lab							
Curriculum Lab							
Special Collections							
Oriental Collections							
Black Studies Service							
Chicano Studies Service							
Serials Desk Assistance							
Slavic Materials Assistance							
Assistance in using any card catalog							
Assistance in using Melvyl online catalog							
Computer Literature Searches							
Tours/Orientation							
Thesis Advising							
Access to items being cataloged							
Request that Library purchase books and journals							
Interdisciplinary Studies 1 or 100							

3. If you have indicated that you are dissatisfied with any of the services in question 2, please pick the two services you are MOST dissatisfied with and briefly indicate why.

4. How effective would the following methods be for increasing YOUR awareness of and ability to use the library's services and resources?

a. librarians giving course-related tours/lectures in the library
( ) very ( ) somewhat ( ) not at all ( ) don't know

b. librarians giving brief course-related lecture in your classroom
( ) very ( ) somewhat ( ) not at all ( ) don't know

c. librarians working with you individually on your research projects
( ) very ( ) somewhat ( ) not at all ( ) don't know

d. doing pre-arranged library assignments developed by faculty and librarians
( ) very ( ) somewhat ( ) not at all ( ) don't know

e. written guides on how to use the library's resources and services
( ) very ( ) somewhat ( ) not at all ( ) don't know

f. artices in Daily Nexus
( ) very ( ) somewhat ( ) not at all ( ) don't know

g. improved signs/directories
( ) very ( ) somewhat ( ) not at all ( ) don't know

h. videotaped instructional programs geared to your course
( ) very ( ) somewhat ( ) not at all ( ) don't know

i. computer-assisted library instruction
( ) very ( ) somewhat ( ) not at all ( ) don't know

j. other, please specify

_____

II. ASSISTANCE

5. How helpful is the library staff in assisting you to use the library?

( ) very ( ) somewhat ( ) not at all ( ) don't know

please comment _____

6. Are library staff members AVAILABLE when you need them?

( ) very ( ) somewhat ( ) not at all ( ) don't know

please comment _____

7. Do you feel that further guidance in the use of the library's resources would help you?

( ) yes ( ) no ( ) don't know

If yes, on which aspects of library use would you find more guidance/information helpful? (check as many as appropriate)

a. ( ) general information on UCSB Library

b. ( ) how to use the card catalog

c. ( ) how to use the online catalog (Melvyl)

d. ( ) the call number system

e. ( ) how to find articles in magazines and journals

f. ( ) how to compile bibliographies

g. ( ) how to find biographical information

h. ( ) availability of reference materials (indexes, bibliographies in your discipline)

i. ( ) how to find serials in the UCSB Library

j. ( ) information on the use of special collections or materials, please specify

_____

k. ( ) other, please specify

_____

V. ACCESS

8. Is there any equipment or technolgoy which you think the library should offer, but does NOT provide currently? Please be specific in your answer, including uses you might make of new equipment or technology.

9. Is there equipment or technology which the library offers NOW which should be improved? Please specify.

10. How important to you are the following ways to access information both inside and outside the Library?

a. consulting the library card catalog or the library serials list
( ) very ( ) somewhat ( ) not at all ( ) dont' know

b. consulting the online catalog (Melvyl)
( ) very ( ) somewhat ( ) not at all ( ) don't know

c. searching printed indexes and abstracting tools (e.g. Reader's Guide, Chemical Abstracts, Psychological Abstracts)
( ) very ( ) somewhat ( ) not at all ( ) don't know

d. bibliographies or references in books or journals
( ) very ( ) somewhat ( ) not at all ( ) don't know

e. consulting library reference books (encyclopedias, directories, dictionaries)
( ) very ( ) somewhat ( ) not at all ( ) don't know

f. consulting a library staff member
( ) very ( ) somewhat ( ) not at all ( ) don't know

g. browsing collections
( ) very ( ) somewhat ( ) not at all ( ) don't know

h. using Interlibrary Loan
( ) very ( ) somewhat ( ) not at all ( ) don't know

i. searching online bibliographic databases using terminals or microcomputers INSIDE the library
( ) very ( ) somewhat ( ) not at all ( ) don't know

j. searching online bibliographic databases using terminals or microcomputers OUTSIDE the library
( ) very ( ) somewhat ( ) not at all ( ) don't know

k. consulting another student
( ) very ( ) somewhat ( ) not at all ( ) don't know

l. consulting your OWN books and journals
( ) very ( ) somewhat ( ) not at all ( ) don't know

m. other, please specify

_____

11. How important would the following methods of delivering information be to you in the FUTURE?

a. searching the library circulation system via terminals IN the library (to find if a book is charged out and when it is due back)
( ) very ( ) somewhat ( ) not at all ( ) don't know

b. searching the library circulation system via terminals OUTSIDE the library
( ) very ( ) somewhat ( ) not at all ( ) don't know

c. terminals for the library's online catalog located in the library book stacks
( ) very ( ) somewhat ( ) not at all ( ) don't know

d. printers attached to library's online catalog terminals
( ) very ( ) somewhat ( ) not at all ( ) don't know

e. Reference/information service available on a 24-hour basis via computer
( ) very ( ) somewhat ( ) not at all ( ) don't know

f. capability to access library online catalog from home or office computers
( ) very ( ) somewhat ( ) not at all ( ) don't know

g. improved training for accessing library's online catalog
( ) very ( ) somewhat ( ) not at all ( ) don't know

h. placing Interlibrary Loan requests from home or office computers
( ) very ( ) somewhat ( ) not at all ( ) dont' know

i. performing online database searches using terminals or microcomputers INSIDE the library without help from library staff (indexes and information that can be accessed via computer)
( ) very ( ) somewhat ( ) not at all ( ) don't know

j. performing online database searches using terminals or microcomputers OUTSIDE the library without help from library staff
( ) very ( ) somewhat ( ) not at all ( ) don't know

k. availability of additional online bibliographic databases (please specify which ones)_____
( ) very ( ) somewhat ( ) not at all ( ) don't know

l. availability of additional non-bibliographic, textual, and numeric databases and data files (please specify which ones)_____

m. copies of magazine articles or other information formats via television monitor
( ) very ( ) somewhat ( ) not at all ( ) don't know

n. other, please specify _____

12. How could the library improve its EXISTING services in support of your study, teaching, or research?

13. If you could change, add, or improve any one aspect of library service what would it be?

VI. COMPUTER USE

14. Do you anticipate acquiring your first computer within the next 5 years?
( ) yes ( ) no ( ) already own one ( ) don't know

-OVER-

15. Where do yo have personal access to:

a. microcomputer

( ) home ( ) office/lab ( ) no access
( ) dorm ( ) microcomputer lab ( ) other_____

b. terminal

( ) home ( ) office/lab ( ) no access
( ) dorm ( ) microcomputer lab ( ) library
( ) other _____ ( ) don't know

c. modem

( ) home ( ) office/lab ( ) no modem
( ) dorm ( ) microcomputer lab ( ) library
( ) other _____ ( ) don't know

16. Are you currently using any commerical computerized information systems? (e.g. DIALOG, BRS, MEDLINE)

( ) yes ( ) no

If yes, which systems? _____

Are you accessing them from your

( ) home ( ) office/lab ( ) microcomputer lab ( ) dorm

( ) library ( ) other_____

Thank you for completing the questionnaire. Don't forget to include your sealed entry for the $50 drawing when returning your questionnaire. Please return the questionnaire by NOVEMBER 20 to be eligible.
Please use the space below or additional sheets as needed for any further comments.

UCSB LIBRARY USER SURVEY (faculty)

What is your discipline at UCSB?_____

I. USE/AWARENESS

1. On the average, how often do you use the library?

a. for general reading (not teaching or research related)

( ) at least twice a week
( ) at least twice a month
( ) less than twice a month
( ) have never used

b. for browsing the collections

( ) at least twice a week
( ) at least twice a month
( ) less than twice a month
( ) have never used

c. to prepare classes

( ) at least twice a week
( ) at least twice a month
( ) less than twice a month
( ) have never used

d. to obtain information for research purposes

( ) at least twice a week
( ) at least twice a month
( ) less than twice a month
( ) have never used

e. to contact a librarian for collection purchases

( ) at least twice a week
( ) at least twice a month
( ) less than twice a month
( ) have never used

2. Please put a check mark indicating how often you use the following services. IN ADDITION, indicate your satisfaction or dissatisfaction with those services you USE. (check all categories that apply).

	at least twice a week	at least twice a month	less than twice a month	aware of but don't use	unaware of	satisfied	dissatisfied
Reference/Information Assistance							
Interlibrary Loan							
Reserve Book Service							
Circulation Service (check-out, recalls)							
Government Publications							
Arts Library Reference							
Art Exhibition Catalog Reference							
Music Service Desk/ Listening Facilities							
Science and Engineering Reference							
Technical Reports Assistance							
Map and Imagery Lab							
Curriculum Lab							
Special Collections							
Oriental Collection							
Black Studies Service							
Chicano Studies Service							
Serials Desk Assistance							
Slavic Materials Assistance							
Assistance in using any card catalog							
Assistance in using Melvyl online catalog							
Computer Literature Searches							
Tours/Orientation							
Access to items being cataloged							
Request that Library purchase books and journals							

3. If you have indicated that you are dissatisfied with any of the services in question 2, please pick the two services you are MOST dissatisfied with and briefly indicate why.

4. Do you provide instruction to your classes on the indexes, bibliographies, and handbooks that are available in your field?

( ) always ( ) sometimes ( ) rarely ( ) never ( ) not applicable

5. How effective would the following methods be for increasing your STUDENTS' awareness of and ability to use the library's services and resources?

a. librarians giving course-related tours/lectures in the library
( ) very ( ) somewhat ( ) not at all ( ) don't know

b. librarians giving brief course-related lecture in your classroom
( ) very ( ) somewhat ( ) not at all ( ) don't know

c. librarians working with your students individually on their research projects
( ) very ( ) somewhat ( ) not at all ( ) don't know

d. doing pre-arranged library assignments developed by faculty and librarians
( ) very ( ) somewhat ( ) not at all ( ) don't know

e. written guides on how to use the library's resources and services
( ) very ( ) somewhat ( ) not at all ( ) don't know

f. articles in Daily Nexus
( ) very ( ) somewhat ( ) not at all ( ) don't know

g. improved signs/directories
( ) very ( ) somewhat ( ) not at all ( ) don't know

h. videotaped instructional programs geared to your course
( ) very ( ) somewhat ( ) not at all ( ) don't know

i. computer-assisted library instruction
( ) very ( ) somewhat ( ) not at all ( ) don't know

j. other, please specify _____

6. How effective would the following methods be for increasing YOUR awareness of and ability to use the library's services and resources?

   a. librarians working with you individually on your research projects
      ( ) very ( ) somewhat ( ) not at all ( ) don't know

   b. UCSB Library seminars to keep faculty informed about new library resources
      ( ) very ( ) somewhat ( ) not at all ( ) don't know

   c. written guides on how to use the library's resources and services
      ( ) very ( ) somewhat ( ) not at all ( ) don't know

   d. improved signs/directories
      ( ) very ( ) somewhat ( ) not at all ( ) don't know

   e. articles in Daily Nexus
      ( ) very ( ) somewhat ( ) not at all ( ) don't know

   f. computer-assisted library instruction
      ( ) very ( ) somewhat ( ) not at all ( ) don't know

   g. other, please specify

      _____

II. ASSISTANCE

7. How helpful is the library staff in assisting you to use the library?

   ( ) very ( ) somewhat ( ) not at all ( ) don't know

   please comment _____

8. Are library staff members AVAILABLE when you need them?

   ( ) usually ( ) sometimes ( ) rarely ( ) don't know

   please comment _____

9. Do you feel that further guidance in the use of the library's resources would help you?

   ( ) yes ( ) no ( ) don't know

   If yes, on which aspects of library use would you find more guidance/information helpful? (check as many as appropriate)

   a. ( ) how to use the card catalog
   b. ( ) how to use the online catalog (Melvyl)
   c. ( ) how to find biographical information
   d. ( ) availability of reference materials (indexes, bibliographies) in your discipline
   e. ( ) how to find serials in the UCSB Library
   f. ( ) information on the use of special collections or materials, please specify _____
   g. ( ) other, please specify _____

V. ACCESS

10. Is there any equipment or technology which you think the library should offer, but does NOT provide currently? Please be specific in your answer, including uses you might make of new equipment or technology.

11. Is there equipment or technology which the library offers NOW which should be improved? Please specify.

12. How important to you are the following ways to access information both inside and outside the Library?

a. consulting the library card catalog or the library serials list
( ) very ( ) somewhat ( ) not at all ( ) don't know

b. consulting the online catalog (Melvyl)
( ) very ( ) somewhat ( ) not at all ( ) don't know

c. searching printed indexes and abstracting tools (e.g. Reader's Guide, Chemical Abstracts, Psychological Abstracts)
( ) very ( ) somewhat ( ) not at all ( ) don't know

d. bibliographies or references in books or journals
( ) very ( ) somewhat ( ) not at all ( ) don't know

e. consulting library reference books (e.g. encyclopedias, directories, dictionaries)
( ) very ( ) somewhat ( ) not at all ( ) don't know

f. consulting a library staff member
( ) very ( ) somewhat ( ) not at all ( ) don't know

g. browsing collections
( ) very ( ) somewhat ( ) not at all ( ) don't know

h. using Interlibrary Loan
( ) very ( ) somewhat ( ) not at all ( ) don't know

i. searching online bibliographic databases using terminals or microcomputers INSIDE the library
( ) very ( ) somewhat ( ) not at all ( ) don't know

j. searching online bibliographic databases using terminals or microcomputers OUTSIDE the library
( ) very ( ) somewhat ( ) not at all ( ) don't know

k. consulting a colleague
( ) very ( ) somewhat ( ) not at all ( ) don't know

l. consulting your OWN books and journals
( ) very ( ) somewhat ( ) not at all ( ) don't know

m. other, please specify

_____

13. How important would the following methods of delivering information be to you in the FUTURE?

a. searching the library circulation system via terminals IN the library (to find if a book is charged out and when it is due back)
( ) very ( ) somewhat ( ) not at all ( ) don't know

b. searching the library circulation system via terminals OUTSIDE the library
( ) very ( ) somewhat ( ) not at all ( ) don't know

c. terminals for the library's online catalog located in the library book stacks
( ) very ( ) somewhat ( ) not at all ( ) don't know

d. printers attached to library's online catalog termianls
( ) very ( ) somewhat ( ) not at all ( ) don't know

e. reference/information service available on a 24-hour basis via computer
( ) very ( ) somewhat ( ) not at all ( ) don't know

f. capability to access library online catalog from home or office computers
( ) very ( ) somewhat ( ) not at all ( ) don't know

g. improved training for accessing library's online catalog
( ) very ( ) somewhat ( ) not at all ( ) don't know

h. placing Interlibrary Loan requests from home or office computers
( ) very ( ) somewhat ( ) not at all ( ) don't know

i. using home or office computers to send reserve book lists to library
( ) very ( ) somewhat ( ) not at all ( ) don't know

j. performing online database searches using terminals or microcomputers INSIDE the library without help from library staff (indexes and information that can be accessed via computer)
( ) very ( ) somewhat ( ) not at all ( ) don't know

k. performing online database searches using terminals or microcomputers OUTSIDE the library without help from library staff
( ) very ( ) somewhat ( ) not at all ( ) don't know

l. availability of additional online bibliographic databases (please specify which ones) _____
( ) very ( ) somewhat ( ) not at all ( ) don't know

m. availability of additional non-bibliographic, textual, and numeric databases and data files (please specify which ones)_____
( ) very ( ) somewhat ( ) not at all ( ) don't know

n. copies of magazine articles or other information formats via television monitor
( ) very ( ) somewhat ( ) not at all ( ) don't know

o. other, please specify _____

14. How could the library improve its EXISTING services in support of your study, teaching, or research?

15. If you could change, add, or improve any one aspect of library service what would it be?

VI. COMPUTER USE

16. Do you anticipate acquiring your first computer within the next 5 years
( ) yes ( ) no ( ) already own one ( ) don't know

17. Where do you have personal access to:

a. microcomputer
( ) home ( ) office/lab ( ) microcomputer lab ( ) library
( ) no access ( ) other _____

b. terminal
( ) home ( ) office/lab ( ) microcomputer lab ( ) library
( ) no access ( ) don't know ( ) other _____

c. modem
( ) home ( ) office/lab ( ) microcomputer lab ( ) library
( ) no modem ( ) don't know ( ) other _____

-OVER-

18. Are you currently using any commerical computerized information systems? (e.g. DIALOG, BRS, MEDLINE)

    ( ) yes ( ) no

    If yes, which systems?_____

    Are you accessing them from your

    ( ) home ( ) office/lab ( ) microcomputer lab ( ) library

    ( ) other_____

19. How do you anticipate technology changing your research needs over the next 5-10 years? Please specify.

Thank you for completing the questionnaire. We appreciate your prompt reply. Please use the space below or additional sheets as needed for any further comments.

Please return the questionnaire by NOVEMBER 20th.

LIBRARY USER SURVEY
FACULTY, GRADUATE STUDENTS, UNDERGRADUATE STUDENTS
NOVEMBER 1985
NOTES ON STATISTICAL TABLES

The faculty received a slightly different questionnaire than the graduate and undergraduate students, and consequently the question numbers vary slightly on the two questionnaires. In order to show comparisons on questions, the faculty statistics are shown under the question number that corresponds to that on the student questionnaires. Where a question was asked only of the faculty or only of the students it has been noted throughout the statistical tables.

UCSB LIBRARY USER SURVEY (FACULTY, GRADUATE STUDENTS, UNDERGRADUATE STUDENTS)
NOVEMBER 1985

	FACULTY		GRADUATE		UNDERGRAD	
	NO.	%	NO.	%	NO.	%
I. USER AWARENESS						
WHAT IS YOUR MAJOR/DISCIPLINE AT UCSB						
() Humanities	128	33	87	16	61	15
() Social Studies	124	32	218	40	148	37
() Science	128	33	239	43	120	30
() Undeclared	-	-	-	-	65	16
() Blank	8	2	6	1	3	1
1. ON THE AVERAGE, HOW OFTEN DO YOU USE THE LIBRARY?						
A. for general reading (not course or research related)						
() at least twice a week	55	14	156	28	105	26
() at least twice a month	108	28	119	22	70	18
() less than twice a month	165	43	196	36	117	29
() have never used	55	14	78	14	105	26
() blank	5	1	-	-	-	-
B. for browsing collections						
() at least twice a week	45	12	90	16	18	5
() at least twice a month	121	31	144	26	74	19
() less than twice a month	182	47	219	40	138	35
() have never used	30	8	90	16	164	41
() blank	10	3	-	-	-	-
*C. to study for courses using own materials						
() at least twice a week	-	-	161	29	234	59
() at least twice a month	-	-	96	17	65	16
() less than twice a month	-	-	182	33	70	18
() have never used	-	-	105	19	28	7
*D. to look up information to do class assignments						
() at least twice a week	-	-	168	31	29	7
() at least twice a month	-	-	189	34	132	33
() less than twice a month	-	-	146	27	170	43
() have never used	-	-	37	7	66	17

	FACULTY		GRADUATE		UNDERGRAD	
	NO.	%	NO.	%	NO.	%
I. *E. to use material reserved for your courses						
() at least twice a week	-	-	73	13	31	8
() at least twice a month	-	-	127	23	117	29
() less than twice a month	-	-	233	42	157	40
() have never used	-	-	102	19	92	23
F. to obtain information for research						
() at least twice a week	127	33	234	43	26	7
() at least twice a month	175	45	183	33	97	24
() less than twice a month	82	21	99	18	184	46
() have never used	2	1	31	6	90	23
() blank	1	-	-	-	-	-
**G. to prepare classes						
() at least twice a week	61	16	-	-	-	-
() at least twice a month	136	35	-	-	-	-
() less than twice a month	145	37	-	-	-	-
() have never used	41	11	-	-	-	-
() blank	5	1	-	-	-	-
**H. to contact a librarian for collection purchases						
() at least twice a week	6	2	-	-	-	-
() at least twice a month	34	9	-	-	-	-
() less than twice a month	250	64	-	-	-	-
() have never used	95	24	-	-	-	-
() blank	3	1	-	-	-	-

*asked only on the graduate and undergraduate surveys
**asked only on the faculty survey

	FACULTY		GRADUATE		UNDERGRAD	
	NO.	%	NO.	%	NO.	%
**2. FREQUENCY OF USE OF SERVICES/ SATISFACTION WITH SERVICES YOU USE.						
A. Reference/Information Assistance						
() at least twice a week	4	1	29	5	5	1
() at least twice a month	60	15	118	21	61	15
() less than twice a month	211	54	251	46	171	43
() aware of but don't use	4	11	65	12	99	25
() unaware of	6	2	6	1	11	3
() blank	66	17	81	15	50	18
() satisfied	241	62	342	62	222	56
() dissatisfied	17	4	37	7	23	6
() appropriate - no answer	30	8	68	12	90	23
() blank	99	26	102	19	65	15
B. Interlibrary loan						
() at least twice a week	8	2	13	2	1	0.2
() at least twice a month	42	11	73	13	8	2
() less than twice a month	269	69	204	37	45	11
() aware of but don't use	52	13	215	39	221	56
() unaware of	2	0.5	26	5	107	27
() blank	15	4	19	3	15	4
() satisfied	286	74	255	49	83	21
() dissatisfied	25	6	48	9	5	1
() appropriate - no answer	40	10	218	39	289	73
() blank	37	10	28	5	20	5
C. Reserve Book Service						
() at least twice a week	16	4	42	8	28	7
() at least twice a month	25	6	89	16	105	26
() less than twice a month	227	59	219	40	133	34
() aware of but don't use	82	21	167	30	99	25
() unaware of	4	1	12	2	22	6
() blank	34	9	21	4	10	3
() satisfied	257	66	317	58	259	65
() dissatisfied	15	4	32	6	10	3
() appropriate - no answer	68	18	160	29	110	28
() blank	48	12	40	7	18	5

**Due to a problem with the design of the questionnaire, we believe the Reference/Information Assistance statistics are too low.

	FACULTY		GRADUATE		UNDERGRAD	
	NO.	%	NO.	%	NO.	%
2.D. Circulation Service						
() at least twice a week	61	16	116	21	11	3
() at least twice a month	151	39	198	36	74	19
() less than twice a month	131	34	155	28	133	34
() aware of but don't use	23	6	53	10	117	29
() unaware of	3	1	10	2	40	10
() blank	19	5	18	3	22	6
() satisfied	296	76	418	76	212	53
() dissatisfied	19	5	22	4	3	1
() appropriate - no answer	22	6	65	12	150	38
() blank	51	13	45	8	30	8
E. Government Publications						
() at least twice a week	1	0.2	5	1	6	2
() at least twice a month	15	4	26	8	14	4
() less than twice a month	120	31	100	18	62	16
() aware of but don't use	207	53	347	63	236	59
() unaware of	17	4	53	10	62	16
() blank	28	7	19	3	17	4
() satisfied	162	42	140	25	108	27
() dissatisfied	6	2	5	1	4	1
() appropriate - no answer	185	48	372	68	262	66
() blank	34	9	33	6	23	6
F. Arts Library Reference						
() at least twice a week	11	3	18	3	6	2
() at least twice a month	16	4	20	4	26	7
() less than twice a month	78	20	56	10	59	15
() aware of but don't use	185	48	268	49	205	52
() unaware of	60	15	167	30	87	22
() blank	37	10	21	4	14	4
() satisfied	128	33	104	19	113	28
() dissatisfied	4	1	6	1	2	1
() appropriate - no answer	211	54	405	74	259	65
() blank	45	12	34	6	22	6

	FACULTY		GRADUATE		UNDERGRAD	
	NO.	%	NO.	%	NO.	%
2.G. Arts Exhibition Catalog Reference						
() at least twice a week	4	1	12	2	-	-
() at least twice a month	6	2	7	1	6	2
() less than twice a month	26	7	29	5	16	4
() aware of but don't use	201	52	211	38	163	41
() unaware of	113	29	270	49	198	50
() blank	38	10	21	4	14	4
() satisfied	80	21	63	11	48	12
() dissatisfied	-	-	2	0.3	3	1
() appropriate - no answer	266	69	456	83	326	82
() blank	42	11	28	5	19	5
H. Music Service Desk/Listening Facilities						
() at least twice a week	8	2	14	3	8	2
() at least twice a month	14	4	12	2	22	6
() less than twice a month	44	11	57	10	69	17
() aware of but don't use	199	51	253	46	174	44
() unaware of	90	23	191	35	108	27
() blank	33	9	23	4	16	4
() satisfied	105	27	100	18	119	30
() dissatisfied	1	0.3	7	1	6	2
() appropriate - no answer	247	64	413	75	254	64
() blank	35	9	30	5	16	4
I. Science & Engineering Reference						
() at least twice a week	13	3	65	12	12	3
() at least twice a month	46	12	102	19	41	10
() less than twice a month	102	26	114	21	90	23
() aware of but don't use	161	41	193	35	177	45
() unaware of	36	9	55	10	66	17
() blank	29	7	21	4	11	3
() satisfied	170	43	242	44	148	37
() dissatisfied	4	1	16	3	10	3
() appropriate - no answer	167	43	238	43	222	56
() blank	47	12	52	9	17	4

	FACULTY		GRADUATE		UNDERGRAD	
	NO.	%	NO.	%	NO.	%
2.J. Technical Reports Assistance						
() at least twice a week	1	0.2	11	2	-	-
() at least twice a month	6	2	16	3	3	1
() less than twice a month	35	9	51	9	10	3
() aware of but don't use	172	44	191	35	160	40
() unaware of	139	36	252	46	209	53
() blank	35	9	29	5	15	4
() satisfied	84	22	84	15	39	10
() dissatisfied	6	2	10	2	3	1
() appropriate - no answer	262	67	422	77	336	85
() blank	35	9	32	6	16	4
K. Map & Imagery Lab						
() at least twice a week	1	0.3	2	0.4	1	0.3
() at least twice a month	6	2	9	2	7	2
() less than twice a month	57	15	63	11	37	9
() aware of but don't use	210	54	294	53	194	49
() unaware of	81	21	159	29	142	36
() blank	33	9	23	4	16	4
() satisfied	110	28	85	15	72	18
() dissatisfied	-	-	2	0.4	2	1
') appropriate - no answer	243	63	431	78	304	77
() blank	35	9	32	6	14	5
L. Curriculum Laboratory						
() at least twice a week	1	0.2	7	1	1	0.2
() at least twice a month	3	1	12	2	3	1
() less than twice a month	24	6	35	0.3	13	3
() aware of but don't use	147	38	185	34	144	36
() unaware of	174	45	286	52	217	55
() blank	38	10	25	6	19	5
() satisfied	73	19	66	12	39	10
() dissatisfied	4	1	7	1	3	1
() appropriate - no answer	274	71	447	81	332	84
() blank	37	10	28	5	23	6

	FACULTY		GRADUATE		UNDERGRAD	
	NO.	%	NO.	%	NO.	%
2.M. Special Collections						
() at least twice a week	3	1	5	1	1	0.2
() at least twice a month	13	3	28	4	3	1
() less than twice a month	112	29	97	18	53	13
() aware of but don't use	171	44	251	46	193	49
() unaware of	53	14	151	27	132	33
() blank	35	9	23	4	15	4
() satisfied	142	37	127	23	85	21
() dissatisfied	2	1	4	1	4	1
() appropriate - no answer	200	52	385	70	288	73
() blank	44	11	34	6	20	5
N. Oriental Collections						
() at least twice a week	3	1	10	2	1	0.2
() at least twice a month	5	1	13	2	2	1
() less than twice a month	12	3	31	6	9	2
() aware of but don't use	240	62	275	50	224	56
() unaware of	90	23	197	36	144	36
() blank	37	9	23	4	17	4
() satisfied	71	18	70	13	40	10
() dissatisfied	-	-	3	1	2	1
() appropriate - no answer	282	72	445	81	336	85
() blank	37	10	31	6	18	5
O. Black Studies Service						
() at least twice a week	3	1	3	1	2	1
() at least twice a month	1	0.2	4	1	2	1
() less than twice a month	19	5	24	4	14	4
() aware of but don't use	217	56	285	52	234	59
() unaware of	110	28	208	38	128	32
() blank	38	10	25	5	17	4
() satisfied	69	18	51	9	45	11
() dissatisfied	-	-	3	1	1	0.2
() appropriate - no answer	282	73	468	85	330	83
() blank	37	10	28	5	20	5

	FACULTY		GRADUATE		UNDERGRAD	
	NO.	%	NO.	%	NO.	%
P. Chicano Studies Service						
() at least twice a week	2	0.5	2	0.3	3	1
() at least twice a month	4	1	8	1	4	1
() less than twice a month	19	5	19	3	10	3
() aware of but don't use	209	54	277	50	223	56
() unaware of	114	29	216	39	141	36
() blank	39	10	27	5	16	4
() satisfied	68	18	49	9	40	10
() dissatisfied	-	-	2	0.3	2	1
() appropriate - no answer	279	72	470	85	335	84
() blank	39	10	29	5	19	5
Q. Serials Desk Assistance						
() at least twice a week	9	2	16	3	1	0.2
() at least twice a mont	43	11	66	12	17	4
() less than twice a mon	201	52	203	37	104	26
() aware of but don't us	86	22	157	29	169	43
() unaware of	15	4	81	15	89	22
() blank	33	9	26	5	17	4
() satisfied	8	2	256	47	123	31
() dissatisfied	232	60	20	4	7	2
() appropriate - no answ	88	23	225	41	236	59
() blank	60	15	49	9	29	7
R. Slavic Materials Assistance						
() at least twice a week	4	1	1	0.2	1	0.2
() at least twice a mont	2	1	2	0.3	-	-
() less than twice a mon	6	2	8	1	4	1
() aware of but don't us	161	42	158	29	124	31
() unaware of	171	44	352	64	249	63
() blank	43	11	28	5	19	5
() satisfied	65	17	31	6	23	6
() dissatisfied	-	-	1	0.2	2	1
() appropriate - no answ	283	73	491	89	352	87
() blank	40	10	27	5	20	5

	FACULTY		GRADUATE		UNDERGRAD	
	NO.	%	NO.	%	NO.	%
?S. Assistance in using any card catalog						
() at least twice a week	3	1	6	1	3	7
() at least twice a month	13	3	19	3	34	9
() less than twice a month	110	28	167	30	127	32
() aware of but don't use	209	54	294	53	188	47
() unaware of	23	6	40	7	31	8
() blank	29	7	24	4	14	4
() satisfied	146	38	190	35	176	44
() dissatisfied	1	0.2	13	2	11	3
() appropriate - no answer	202	52	303	55	188	47
() blank	39	10	44	8	22	6
T. Assistance in using Melvyl on-line catalog						
() at least twice a week	3	1	9	2	6	2
() at least twice a month	13	3	55	6	27	7
() less than twice a month	81	21	133	22	95	24
() aware of but don't use	200	52	268	49	159	40
() unaware of	57	15	94	17	91	23
() blank	34	9	24	4	19	5
() satisfied	123	32	139	25	122	31
() dissatisfied	13	3	45	8	28	7
() appropriate - no answer	215	55	328	60	223	56
() blank	37	10	38	7	24	6
U. Computer literature searches						
() at least twice a week	2	1	14	3	4	1
() at least twice a month	12	3	19	4	9	2
() less than twice a month	94	24	101	18	36	9
() aware of but don't use	174	45	221	40	150	38
() unaware of	72	19	175	32	176	44
() blank	34	9	20	4	22	6
() satisfied	116	30	112	20	65	16
() dissatisfied	15	4	32	6	7	2
() appropriate - no answer	212	55	375	68	304	77
() blank	45	12	31	6	21	5

	FACULTY		GRADUATE		UNDERGRAD	
	NO.	%	NO.	%	NO.	%
2 V. Tours/Orientation						
() at least twice a week	-	-	1	0.2	-	-
() at least twice a month	-	-	-	-	-	-
() less than twice a month	24	6	53	10	36	9
() aware of but don't use	263	68	387	70	267	67
() unaware of	59	15	87	16	76	19
() blank	41	11	22	4	17	4
() satisfied	74	19	80	15	68	17
() dissatisfied	-	-	5	1	4	1
() appropriate - no answer	278	72	439	80	306	77
() blank	36	9	26	5	19	5
W. Access to items being cataloged						
() at least twice a week	2	1	12	2	3	1
() at least twice a month	10	3	12	2	18	5
() less than twice a month	112	29	88	16	29	7
() aware of but don't use	142	37	102	19	108	27
() unaware of	82	21	302	55	213	54
() blank	39	10	34	6	25	6
() satisfied	138	36	101	18	61	15
() dissatisfied	15	4	20	3	7	2
() appropriate - no answer	189	49	388	71	306	77
() blank	46	12	40	7	22	6
X. Request that Library purchase books and journals						
() at least twice a week	5	1	1	0.2	-	-
() at least twice a month	29	7	3	1	1	0.2
() less than twice a month	220	57	54	10	7	2
() aware of but don't use	85	22	178	32	121	30
() unaware of	26	7	288	52	248	62
() blank	23	6	26	2	19	5
() satisfied	222	57	57	10	31	8
() dissatisfied	24	6	17	3	6	2
() appropriate - no answer	100	26	442	80	343	86
() blank	42	11	33	6	17	4

	FACULTY		GRADUATE		UNDERGRAD	
	NO.	%	NO.	%	NO.	%
2Y. Thesis Advising						
() at least twice a week	-	-	1	0.2	-	-
() at least twice a month	-	-	1	0.2	1	0.2
() less than twice a month	-	-	27	5	1	0.2
() aware of but don't use	-	-	176	32	96	24
() unaware of	-	-	321	58	281	71
() blank	-	-	24	4	17	4
() satisfied	-	-	42	8	26	7
() dissatisfied	-	-	6	1	2	1
() appropriate - no answer	-	-	477	87	352	89
() blank	-	-	25	5	17	4
*Z. Interdisciplinary Studies 1 or 100						
() at least twice a week	-	-	-	-	8	2
() at least twice a month	-	-	1	-	7	2
() less than twice a month	-	-	10	2	25	6
() aware of but don't use	-	-	124	23	133	34
() unaware of	-	-	378	69	193	49
() blank	-	-	37	7	30	8
() satisfied	-	-	39	7	62	16
() dissatisfied	-	-	3	0.5	6	2
() appropriate - no answer	-	-	475	86	304	77
() blank	-	-	32	6	24	6

* Asked only on the graduate and undergraduate surveys.

	FACULTY		GRADUATE		UNDERGRAD	
	NO.	%	NO.	%	NO.	%
3. IF YOU HAVE INDICATED THAT YOU ARE DISSATISFIED WITH ANY OF THE SERVICES IN QUESTION 2, PLEASE PICK THE TWO SERVICES YOU ARE MOST DISSATISFIED WITH AND BRIEFLY INDICATE WHY.						
() Reference/Information Assistance	11	3	28	5	26	++
() Interlibrary Loan	25	6	37	7	7	-
() Reserve Book Service	15	4	27	5	8	-
() Circulation Service (check-out, recalls)	15	4	18	3	1	-
() Government Publications	3	1	3	1	1	-
() Arts Library Reference	2	1	3	1	-	-
() Art Exhibition Catalog Reference	-	-	1	0.2	-	-
() Music Service Desk/ Listening Facilities	1	0.2	6	1	3	-
() Science and Engineering Reference	3	1	16	3	7	-
() Technical Reports Assistance	2	1	6	1	1	-
() Map and Imagery Lab	-	-	1	0.2	-	-
() Curriculum Lab	2	1	4	1	1	-
() Special Collections	2	1	2	0.3	2	-
() Oriental Collections	-	-	2	0.3	-	-
() Black Studies Service	-	-	1	0.2	-	-
() Chicano Studies Service	-	-	-	-	-	-

		FACULTY		GRADUATE		UNDERGRAD	
		NO.	%	NO.	%	NO.	%
3.	() Serials Desk Assistance	7	2	16	3	3	-
	() Slavic Materials Assistance	-	-	-	-	-	-
	() Assistance in using any card catalog	3	1	2	0.3	4	-
	() Assistance in using Melvyl online catalog	9	2	32	6	21	-
	() Computer Literature Searches	6	2	16	3	4	-
	() Tours/Orientation	-	-	2	0.3	-	-
	() Access to items being cataloged	2	1	12	2	-	-
	() Request that Library purchase books and journals	20	4	9	2	6	-
	*() Thesis advising	-	-	1	0.2	1	-
	*() IS1 of 100	-	-	1	0.2	3	-
	() Total possible responses	696	-	1100	-	794	-

++all percentages for the undergraduate statistics are less than 0.3%.

*Asked only on the graduate and undergraduate surveys

	FACULTY		GRADUATE		UNDERGRAD	
	NO.	%	NO.	%	NO.	%
**4. DO YOU PROVIDE INSTUCTION TO YOUR CLASSES ON THE INDEXES, BIBLIOGRAPHIES AND HANDOUTS THAT ARE AVAILABLE IN YOUR FIELD?						
() always	64	16	-	-	-	-
() sometimes	138	36	-	-	-	-
() rarely	87	22	-	-	-	-
() never	66	17	-	-	-	-
() not applicable	28	7	-	-	-	-
() blank	5	1	-	-	-	-
4. HOW EFFECTIVE WOULD THE FOLLOWING METHODS BE FOR INCREASING YOUR AWARENESS (STUDENTS)/YOUR STUDENT'S AWARENESS (FACULTY) OF AND ABILITY TO USE THE LIBRARY'S SERVICES AND RESOURCES?						
A. Librarians giving course-related tours/lectures in the library						
() very	121	31	109	20	121	30
() somewhat	143	37	216	39	186	47
() not at all	48	12	158	29	57	14
() don't know	56	14	60	11	32	8
() blank	19	5	7	1	-	-
B. Librarians giving brief course-related lecture in your classroom						
() very	53	14	104	19	109	27
() somewhat	110	28	198	36	186	47
() not at all	135	35	168	31	68	17
() don't know	71	18	67	12	33	8
() blank	18	5	13	2	1	0.2
C. Librarians working with you individually on your research projects						
() very	143	37	239	48	216	54
() somewhat	129	33	178	32	113	28
() not at all	47	12	72	13	27	7
() don't know	52	13	54	9	40	10
() blank	17	5	7	1	1	0.2

**asked only on the faculty survey

	FACULTY		GRADUATE		UNDERGRAD	
	NO.	%	NO.	%	NO.	%
4.D. Doing pre-arranged library assignments developed by faculty and librarians						
() very	63	16	75	14	56	14
() somewhat	109	28	142	26	141	36
() not at all	100	26	221	40	123	31
() don't know	94	24	96	17	75	19
() blank	22	6	16	3	2	1
E. Written guides on how to use the library's resources and services						
() very	137	35	278	51	212	53
() somewhat	182	47	212	39	147	37
() not at all	24	6	26	5	23	6
() don't know	31	8	24	4	12	3
() blank	14	4	10	2	3	1
F. Articles in Daily Nexus						
() very	34	9	74	13	76	19
() somewhat	119	31	251	46	205	52
() not at all	100	26	146	27	75	19
() don't know	115	30	63	11	40	10
() blank	20	5	16	3	1	0.2
G. Improved signs/directories						
() very	69	18	162	29	127	32
() somewhat	149	38	253	46	196	49
() not at all	49	13	59	11	44	11
() don't know	93	24	63	11	30	8
() blank	28	7	13	2	-	-
H. Videotaped instructional programs geared to your course						
() very	43	11	85	15	127	32
() somewhat	94	24	206	37	154	39
() not at all	118	30	147	27	67	17
() don't know	109	28	100	18	49	12
() blank	23	6	12	2	-	-

	FACULTY		GRADUATE		UNDERGRAD	
	NO.	%	NO.	%	NO.	%
4.I. Computer assisted library instruction						
() very	41	11	143	26	96	24
() somewhat	130	34	235	43	178	45
() not at all	62	16	81	15	71	18
() don't know	132	34	79	14	52	13
() blank	23	6	12	2	-	-
J. Other, please specify						
Commented	32	8	76	14	43	11
Left blank	356	92	474	86	352	89

	FACULTY		GRADUATE		UNDERGRAD	
	NO.	%	NO.	%	NO.	%
5. HOW HELPFUL IS THE LIBRARY STAFF IN ASSISTING YOU TO USE THE LIBRARY?						
( ) very	272	70	313	57	169	43
( ) somewhat	79	20	182	33	136	34
( ) not at all	8	2	4	1	9	2
( ) don't know	18	5	33	6	75	19
( ) blank	11	3	17	3	8	2
( ) comments	383	99	545	99	396	99

	FACULTY		GRADUATE		UNDERGRAD	
	NO.	%	NO.	%	NO.	%
**6. HOW EFFECTIVE WOULD THE FOLLOWING METHODS BE FOR INCREASING YOUR AWARENESS OF AND ABILITY TO USE THE LIBRARY'S SERVICES AND RESOURCES?						
A. Librarians working individually on your research projects						
() very	105	27	-	-	-	-
() somewhat	129	33	-	-	-	-
() not at all	90	23	-	-	-	-
() don't know	42	11	-	-	-	-
() blank	22	6	-	-	-	-
B. UCSB Library seminars to keep faculty informed about new library resources						
() very	58	15	-	-	-	-
() somewhat	159	41	-	-	-	-
() not at all	83	21	-	-	-	-
() don't know	64	16	-	-	-	-
() blank	24	6	-	-	-	-
C. Written guides on how to use the library's resources and services						
() very	105	27	-	-	-	-
() somewhat	182	47	-	-	-	-
() not at all	37	10	-	-	-	-
() don't know	40	10	-	-	-	-
() blank	24	6	-	-	-	-
D. Improved signs/director						
() very	64	16	-	-	-	-
() somewhat	148	38	-	-	-	-
() not at all	71	18	-	-	-	-
() don't know	75	19	-	-	-	-
() blank	30	8	-	-	-	-
E. Articles in Daily Nexus						
() very ----- -----	12	3	-	-	-	-
() somewhat	63	16	-	-	-	-
() not at all	221	57	-	-	-	-
() don't know	66	17	-	-	-	-
() blank	26	7	-	-	-	-

** Asked only on the faculty survey.

	FACULTY		GRADUATE		UNDERGRAD	
	NO.	%	NO.	%	NO.	%
**6 F. Computer assisted library instruction						
() very	41	11	-	-	-	-
() somewhat	123	32	-	-	-	-
() not at all	100	26	-	-	-	-
() don't know	95	24	-	-	-	-
() blank	29	7	-	-	-	-
5. HOW HELPFUL IS THE LIBRARY STAFF IN ASSISTING YOU TO USE THE LIBRARY?						
() very	272	70	313	57	169	43
() somewhat	79	20	182	33	136	34
() not at all	8	2	4	1	9	2
() don't know	18	5	33	6	75	19
() blank	11	3	17	3	8	2
() comments	383	99	545	99	396	99
6. ARE LIBRARY STAFF MEMBERS AVAILABLE WHEN YOU NEED THEM?						
() very	304	78	273	50	151	38
() somewhat	55	14	221	40	161	41
() not at all	7	2	8	1	8	2
() don't know	12	3	30	5	69	17
() blank	10	3	18	3	8	2
() comments	384	99	545	99	396	99
7. DO YOU FEEL THAT FURTHER GUIDANCE IN THE USE OF THE LIBRARY'S RESOURCES WOULD HELP YOU?						
() yes	144	37	371	68	225	69
() no	139	36	101	18	53	13
() don't know	87	22	70	13	59	15
() blank	18	5	8	1	8	2

**Asked only on the faculty survey.

	FACULTY		GRADUATE		UNDERGRAD	
	NO.	%	NO.	%	NO.	%
IF YES, ON WHICH ASPECT OF LIBRARY USE WOULD YOU FIND MORE GUIDANCE/INFORMATION HELPFUL? (check as many as appropriate)						
*7 A. General information on UCSB library						
() would be helpful	-	-	122	22	178	45
() would not be helpful	-	-	253	46	111	28
() answered no above or don't know	-	-	175	32	108	27
B. How to use the card catalog						
() would be helpful	7	2	38	7	66	17
() would not be helpful	374	96	333	61	221	56
() answered no above or don't know	7	2	179	33	110	28
C. How to use the online catalog (MELVYL)						
() would be helpful	99	26	163	30	149	38
() would not be helpful	282	73	216	39	143	36
() answered no above or don't know	7	2	171	32	105	27
*D. The call number system						
() would be helpful	-	-	60	11	88	22
() would not be helpful	-	-	312	57	199	50
() answered no above or don't know	-	-	178	33	110	28
*E. How to find articles in magazines and journals						
() would be helpful	-	-	171	31	174	44
() would not be helpful	-	-	203	37	116	29
() answered no above or don't know	-	-	176	32	107	27
*F. How to compile bibliographies						
() would be helpful	-	-	104	19	102	26
() would not be helpful	-	-	271	49	188	47
() answered no above or don't know	-	-	175	32	107	27

* Asked only on the graduate and undergraduate surveys.

	FACULTY		GRADUATE		UNDERGRAD	
	NO.	%	NO.	%	NO.	%
7 G. How to find biographical information						
() would be helpful	32	8	84	15	92	23
() would not be helpful	349	70	289	53	196	49
() answered no above or don't know	7	2	177	33	109	27
H. Availability of reference materials (indexes, bibliographies) in your discipline						
() would be helpful	105	27	254	46	176	44
() would not be helpful	276	71	126	23	119	30
() answered no above or don't know	7	2	170	31	102	26
I. How to find serials in the UCSB library						
() would be helpful	31	8	134	24	134	34
() would not be helpful	350	90	240	44	157	40
() answered no above or don't know	7	2	176	32	106	27
J. Information on the use of special collections or materials						
() would be helpful	38	10	87	16	89	22
() would not be helpful	349	88	287	52	199	50
() answered no above or don't know	7	2	176	32	109	28
K. Other						
() Commented	24	6	87	16	25	6
() Blank	364	94	463	84	372	94

	FACULTY		GRADUATE		UNDERGRAD	
	NO.	%	NO.	%	NO.	%
+8. IS THERE ANY EQUIPMENT OR TECHNOLOGY WHICH YOU THINK THE LIBRARY SHOULD OFFER, BUT DOES NOT PROVIDE CURRENTLY? PLEASE BE SPECIFIC IN YOUR ANSWER, INCLUDING USES YOU MIGHT MAKE OF NEW EQUIPMENT OR TECHNOLOGY?						
() Commented	388	100	550	100	-	-
() Blank	-	-	-	-	-	-
+ 9. IS THERE EQUIPMENT OR TECHNOLOGY WHICH THE LIBRARY OFFERS NOW WHICH SHOULD BE IMPROVED? PLEASE SPECIFY?						
() Commented	388	100	550	100	-	-
() Blank	-	-	-	-	-	-

+ Open-ended question. Statstics only indicate the number of responses.

	FACULTY		GRADUATE		UNDERGRAD	
	NO.	%	NO.	%	NO.	%
10 F. Consulting a library staff member						
() very	120	31	164	30	167	42
() somewhat	214	55	315	57	172	43
() not at all	31	8	37	7	27	7
() don't know	8	2	31	6	28	7
() blank	15	4	3	1	3	1
G. Browsing collections						
() very	115	30	102	19	40	10
() somewhat	197	51	278	51	181	46
() not at all	47	12	113	21	91	23
() don't know	11	3	40	9	81	20
() blank	18	5	8	2	4	1
H. Using interlibrary loan						
() very	205	53	196	36	31	8
() somewhat	147	38	180	33	66	17
() not at all	15	4	73	13	90	23
() don't know	9	2	93	17	207	52
() blank	12	3	8	1	3	1
I. Searching online bibliographic databases using terminals or microcomputers INSIDE the library						
() very	71	18	127	23	45	11
() somewhat	123	32	138	25	84	21
() not at all	82	21	82	15	73	18
() don't know	95	24	192	35	190	48
() blank	-	-	-	-	5	1
J. Searching online bibliographic databases using terminals or microcomputers OUTSIDE the library						
() very	77	20	71	26	20	5
() somewhat	65	17	96	17	34	9
() not at all	106	27	142	13	112	28
() don't know	119	31	219	40	224	56
() blank	-	-	-	-	7	2

	FACULTY		GRADUATE		UNDERGRAD	
	NO.	%	NO.	%	NO.	%
10K. Consulting another student/ colleague						
() very	145	37	73	13	66	17
() somewhat	197	51	289	53	237	60
() not at all	23	6	140	26	63	16
() don't know	6	2	39	7	24	6
() blank	17	4	8	1	7	2
L. Consulting your own books and journals						
() very	272	70	256	47	110	28
() somewhat	84	22	245	45	196	49
() not at all	10	3	25	5	47	12
() don't know	6	2	16	3	38	10
() blank	16	4	7	1	6	2
M. Other, please specify						
() Commented	9	2	25	5	14	4
() Left Blank	379	98	524	95	383	96

	FACULTY		GRADUATE		UNDERGRAD	
	NO.	%	NO.	%	NO.	%
11. HOW IMPORTANT WOULD THE FOLLOWING METHODS OF DELIVERING INFORMATION BE TO YOU IN THE FUTURE?						
A. Searching the library circulation system via terminals IN the library						
() very	200	52	359	65	239	60
() somewhat	124	32	150	27	116	29
() not at all	19	5	15	3	12	3
() don't know	25	6	19	3	25	6
() blank	20	5	7	1	5	1
B. Searching library circulation system via terminals OUTSIDE the library						
() very	180	46	218	40	114	29
() somewhat	95	24	184	33	140	35
() not at all	39	10	71	13	64	16
() don't know	54	14	66	12	73	18
() blank	20	5	11	2	6	2
C. Terminals for library's online catalog located in library book stacks						
() very	123	32	210	38	113	28
() somewhat	145	37	208	38	154	39
() not at all	32	8	57	10	45	11
() don't know	64	16	59	11	78	20
() blank	24	6	16	3	7	2
D. Printers attached to library's online catalog terminals						
() very	97	25	204	37	151	38
() somewhat	122	31	182	33	132	33
() not at all	46	12	75	14	41	10
() don't know	98	25	76	14	67	17
() blank	25	6	13	2	6	2
E. Ref/info service available on a 24 hr basis via computer						
() very	129	33	267	49	203	51
() somewhat	132	34	174	32	119	30
() not at all	41	11	51	9	31	8
() don't know	60	15	52	9	38	10
() blank	26	7	6	1	6	2

	FACULTY		GRADUATE		UNDERGRAD	
	NO.	%	NO.	%	NO.	%
11.F. Capability to access library online catalog from home or office computers						
() very	180	46	245	45	127	32
() somewhat	80	21	154	28	108	27
() not at all	58	15	92	17	84	21
() don't know	45	12	51	9	72	18
() blank	25	6	8	1	6	2
G. Improved training for accessing library online catalog						
() very	112	29	208	38	163	41
() somewhat	141	36	220	40	137	35
() not at all	41	11	54	10	29	7
() don't know	63	16	60	11	59	15
() blank	31	8	8	1	9	2
H. Placing ILL requests from home or office computers						
() very	156	40	209	38	63	16
() somewhat	110	28	143	26	83	21
() not at all	55	14	103	19	92	23
() don't know	43	11	85	15	151	38
() blank	24	6	10	1	8	2
I. Performing online database searches using terminals or microcomputers INSIDE library without help from library staff						
() very	110	28	279	51	125	31
() somewhat	117	30	156	28	126	32
() not at all	36	9	27	5	32	8
() don't know	92	24	78	14	106	27
() blank	33	9	10	2	8	2
J. Performing online database searches using terminals or microcomputers OUTSIDE library without help from library staff						
() very	118	30	188	34	67	17
() somewhat	86	22	145	26	108	27
() not at all	52	13	75	14	58	15
() don't know	97	25	130	24	154	39
() blank	35	9	12	2	10	3

	FACULTY		GRADUATE		UNDERGRAD	
	NO.	%	NO.	%	NO.	%
11.K. Availability of additional online bibliographic databases						
() very	39	10	82	15	10	3
() somewhat	26	7	47	9	12	4
() not at all	41	11	37	7	35	9
() don't know	212	55	285	52	283	71
() blank	69	18	98	18	52	13
***L. Availability of additional non-biblio, textual & numeric databases & datafiles						
() very	24	14	-	-	-	-
() somewhat	23	6	-	-	-	-
() not at all	54	6	-	-	-	-
() don't know	218	56	-	-	-	-
() blank	68	18	-	-	-	-
M. Copies of magazine articles or other information via television monitor						
() very	73	19	162	29	123	31
() somewhat	83	21	165	30	153	39
() not at all	77	20	91	17	41	10
() don't know	107	28	110	20	64	16
() blank	48	12	22	4	15	3
*N. Using home or office computers to send reserve book lists to the library						
() very	118	30	-	-	-	-
() somewhat	104	27	-	-	-	-
() not at all	91	23	-	-	-	-
() don't know	45	12	-	-	-	-
() blank	30	8	-	-	-	-
O. Other, please specify						
() commented	7	2	16	3	13	3
() left blank	381	98	534	97	384	97

***Due to a problem with the design of the student questionnaire, there are no statistics for this question.

		FACULTY		GRADUATE		UNDERGRAD	
		NO.	%	NO.	%	NO.	%
+12.	HOW COULD THE LIBRARY IMPROVE ITS EXISTING SERVICES IN SUPPORT OF YOUR STUDY, TEACHING, OR RESEARCH?						
	() Commented	388	100	549	99	-	-
	() Left blank	-	-	1	-	-	-
+13.	IF YOU COULD CHANGE, ADD, OR IMPROVE ANY ONE ASPECT OF LIBRARY SERVICE, WHAT WOULD IT BE?						
	() Commented	388	100	547	99	-	-
	() Left blank	-	-	3	1	-	-
14.	DO YOU ANTICIPATE ACQUIRING YOUR FIRST COMPUTER WITHIN THE NEXT 5 YEARS?						
	() yes	105	27	252	46	172	43
	() no	50	13	66	12	85	21
	() already own	193	50	155	28	54	14
	() don't know	23	6	72	13	79	20
	() blank	16	4	4	1	7	2

+ Open-ended survey question. Statistics only indicate the number of responses.

	FACULTY		GRADUATE		UNDERGRAD	
	NO.	%	NO.	%	NO.	%
15. WHERE DO YOU HAVE PERSONAL ACCESS TO:						
A. Microcomputer						
() blank	28	7	33	6	21	5
() home	47	12	65	12	44	11
() dorm	-	-	1	0.2	14	4
() office/lab	111	29	122	22	14	4
() microcomputer lab	3	1	50	11	63	16
() no access	57	15	121	22	161	41
() other	3	1	20	4	27	7
() home/dorm	-	-	-	-	6	2
() office/microlab	6	2	26	5	10	3
() dorm/microlab	-	-	-	-	2	1
() office/library	1	0.3	-	-		
() home/office/microlab	16	4	24	4	3	1
() office/microlab/other	-	-	-	-	2	1
() microlab/other	-	-	2	0.4	2	1
() office/other	1	0.3	2	0.4	2	1
() home/dorm/lab	-	-	-	-	5	1
() home/microlab	2	0.5	9	2	13	3
() home/office/other	1	0.3	2	0.4	1	0.3
() home/office/m.lab/lib	1	0.3	-	-	-	-
() office/m.lab/library	1	0.3	-	-	-	-
() home/microlab/library	-	-	1	0.2	-	-
() home/office/library	2	0.5	-	-	-	-
() home/dorm/office/m.lab	-	-	-	-	1	0.3
() home/other	1	0.3	1	0.2	-	-
() dorm/office/lab	-	-	-	-	1	0.3
() home/office/lab/other	-	-	1	0.2	-	-
() library	7	2	-	-	-	-
() home/office	98	25	59	11	5	1
() don't know	1	0.3	3	1		

	FACULTY		GRADUATE		UNDERGRAD	
	NO.	%	NO.	%	NO.	%
15B. Terminal						
( ) blank	55	14	45	8	28	7
( ) home	19	5	36	7	36	9
( ) dorm	-	-	1	0.2	5	1
( ) office/lab	128	33	165	30	20	5
( ) microcomputer lab	5	1	36	7	50	13
( ) no access	83	21	94	17	127	32
( ) other	5	1	23	4	19	5
( ) home/dorm	-	-	-	-	4	1
( ) office/microlab	2	1	15	3	6	2
( ) dorm/microlab	-	-	-	-	1	0.3
( ) office/library	3	1	7	1	4	1
( ) home/office/microlab	5	1	8	1	1	0.3
( ) office/microlab/other	-	-	-	-	1	0.3
( ) home/library	1	1	1	1	2	1
( ) microlab/other	-	-	2	0.4	1	0.3
( ) office/other	-	-	5	1	1	0.3
( ) dorm/library	-	-	3	1	3	1
( ) home/dorm/lab	-	-	-	-	4	1
( ) home/microlab	-	-	4	1	4	1
( ) office/m.lab/other/lib	-	-	-	-	2	1
( ) home/office/other	1	0.3	-	-	-	-
( ) library/other	-	-	5	1	3	1
( ) home/office/m.lab/lib	3	1	3	1	-	-
( ) office/microlab/library	1	0.3	3	1	-	-
( ) home/microlab/library	-	-	2	0.4	1	0.3
( ) home/office/library	3	1	-	-	1	0.3
( ) home/dorm/office/m.lab	-	-	-	-	-	-
( ) home/other	-	-	-	-	-	-
( ) dorm/office/lab	-	-	-	-	-	-
( ) home/office/lab/other	-	-	-	-	-	-
( ) library	14	4	37	7	31	8
( ) home/office	42	11	26	5	3	1
( ) don't know	16	4	26	5	39	10

	FACULTY		GRADUATE		UNDERGRAD	
	NO.	%	NO.	%	NO.	%
15 C. Modem						
( ) blank	67	17	55	10	30	8
( ) home	43	11	46	8	23	6
( ) dorm	-	-	-	-	7	2
( ) office/lab	56	14	65	12	4	1
( ) microcomputer lab	-	-	11	2	9	2
( ) no access	142	37	227	41	157	40
( ) other	4	1	6	1	14	4
( ) home/dorm	-	-	-	-	5	1
( ) office/microlab	-	-	1	0.2	1	0.3
( ) dorm/microlab	-	-	-	-	-	-
( ) office/library	-	-	1	0.2	-	-
( ) home/office/microlab	-	-	1	0.2	-	-
( ) home/library	1	1	1	1	1	1
( ) office/microlab/other	-	-	-	-	-	-
( ) microlab/other	-	-	-	-	-	-
( ) dorm/library	-	-	1	1	-	-
( ) office/other	1	0.3	1	0.2	-	-
( ) home/dorm/lab	-	-	-	-	1	0.3
( ) home/microlab	-	-	1	0.2	-	-
( ) home/office/other	-	-	-	-	-	-
( ) home/office/m.lab/lib	1	0.3	-	-	-	-
( ) office/microlab/library	-	-	-	-	1	0.3
( ) home/microlab/library	-	-	1	0.2	-	-
( ) home/office/library	-	-	-	-	-	-
( ) home/dorm/office/m.lab	-	-	-	-	-	-
( ) home/other	-	-	-	-	-	-
( ) dorm/office/lab	-	-	-	-	-	-
( ) home/office/lab/other	-	-	-	-	-	-
( ) library	3	1	3	1	4	1
( ) home/office	30	8	22	4	5	1
( ) don't know	39	10	104	19	135	34

	FACULTY		GRADUATE		UNDERGRAD	
	NO.	%	NO.	%	NO.	%
16. ARE YOU CURRENTLY USING ANY COMMERCIAL COMPUTERIZED DATA SYSTEMS?						
() yes	35	9	35	6	13	3
() no	327	84	479	87	363	91
() blank	26	7	33	6	21	5
IF YES, WHICH SYSTEMS? ARE YOU ACCESSING THEM FROM:						
() home	10	3	5	1	3	1
() dorm	-	-	-	-	-	-
() office/lab	10	3	15	3	4	1
() microcomputer lab	1	0.3	2	0.4	2	1
() no access	-	-	-	-	-	-
() other	2	1	2	0.4	4	1
() home/dorm	-	-	-	-	-	-
() office/microlab	-	-	1	0.2	3	1
() dorm/microlab	-	-	-	-	-	-
() office/lib	1	0.3	-	-	-	-
() home/office/microlab	-	-	-	-	-	-
() office/microlab/other	-	-	-	-	1	0.3
() microlab/other	-	-	-	-	-	-
() office/other	-	-	-	-	-	-
() home/dorm/lab	-	-	-	-	-	-
() home/microlab	-	-	-	-	-	-
() home/office/other	-	-	-	-	-	-
() home/office/m.lab/lib	-	-	-	-	-	-
() office/microlab/lib	-	-	-	-	-	-
() home/microlab/lib	-	-	-	-	-	-
() home/office/lib	2	1	1	0.2	-	-
() home/dorm/office/m.la	-	-	-	-	-	-
() home/other	-	-	-	-	-	-
() dorm/office/lab	-	-	-	-	-	-
() home/office/lab/other	-	-	-	-	-	-
() library	12	3	11	2	-	-
() home/office	-	-	-	-	-	-
() not accessing	326	84	480	87	359	90
() blank	24	6	27	5	19	5
() don't know						

	FACULTY		GRADUATE		UNDERGRAD	
	NO.	%	NO.	%	NO.	%
**19. HOW DO YOU ANTICIPATE TECHNOLOGY CHANGING YOUR RESEARCH NEEDS OVER THE NEXT 5-10 YEARS? PLEASE SPECIFY.						
() Commented	382	98	-	-	-	-
() Left blank	6	2	-	-	-	-

** Asked only on the faculty survey. Open-ended question - Statistics indicate only the number of responses.

USER NEEDS AND EDUCATION

STAFF SURVEY

I. AWARENESS

1. In your opinion are users aware of the range of information and reference SERVICES offered by the UCSB Library? (e.g. computer-based literature searching, thesis advising, ILL, availability of equipment such as microform readers)

FACULTY

( ) very 02 ( ) somewhat 01 ( ) little 00 ( ) don't know 09 ( ) n/a 08

Comments _____

GRADUATE STUDENTS

( ) very 02 ( ) somewhat 01 ( ) little 00 ( ) don't know 09 ( ) n/a 08

Comments _____

UNDERGRADUATES

( ) very 02 ( ) somewhat 01 ( ) little 00 ( ) don't know 09 ( ) n/a 08

Comments _____

2. In your opinion are users aware of th range of information and reference SOURCES offered by the UCSB Library? (e.g. basic reference tools, specific collections, online databases, etc.)

FACULTY

( ) very 02 ( ) somewhat 01 ( ) little 00 ( ) don't know 09 ( ) n/a 08

Comments _____

GRADUATE STUDENTS

( ) very 02 ( ) somewhat 01 ( ) little 00 ( ) don't know 09 ( ) n/a 08

Comments _____

UNDERGRADUATES

( ) very 02 ( ) somewhat 01 ( ) little 00 ( ) don't know 09 ( ) n/a 08

Comments _____

3. How effective would the following means or methods be for increasing STUDENT awareness of and ability to use our information sources?

a. librarians giving course-related tours/lectures in the library
( ) very 02 ( ) somewhat 01 ( ) not at all 00 ( ) don't know 09 ( ) n/a 08

b. librarians giving brief course-related lecture in student classes
( ) very 02 ( ) somewhat 01 ( ) not at all 00 ( ) don't know 09 ( ) n/a 08

c. librarians working with students individually on their research projects
( ) very 02 ( ) somewhat 01 ( ) not at all 00 ( ) don't know 09 ( ) n/a 08

d. students doing class-related library assignments developed by faculcy and librarians
( ) very 02 ( ) somewhat 01 ( ) not at all 00 ( ) don't know 09 ( ) n/a 08

e. written guides on how to use the library's sources and services
( ) very 02 ( ) somewhat 01 ( ) not at all 00 ( ) don't know 09 ( ) n/a 08

f. articles in Daily Nexus
( ) very 02 ( ) somewhat 01 ( ) not at all 00 ( ) don't know 09 ( ) n/a 08

g. improved signs/directories
( ) very 02 ( ) somewhat 01 ( ) not at all 00 ( ) don't know 09 ( ) n/a 08

h. videotaped instructional programs geared to specific courses
( ) very 02 ( ) somewhat 01 ( ) not at all 00 ( ) don't know 09 ( ) n/a 08

i. computer-assisted library instruction
( ) very 02 ( ) somewhat 01 ( ) not at all 00 ( ) don't know 09 ( ) n/a 08

j. any future UCSB Library online catalog
( ) very 02 ( ) somewhat 01 ( ) not at all 00 ( ) don't know 09 ( ) n/a 08

k. remote terminals to access library's holdings
( ) very 02 ( ) somewhat 01 ( ) not at all 00 ( ) don't know 09 ( ) n/a 08

l. user access to data bases without the aid of a librarian
( ) very 02 ( ) somewhat 01 ( ) not at all 00 ( ) don't know 09 ( ) n/a 08

m. other, please specify _____

4. How effective would the following means or methods be for increasing FACULTY awareness of and ability to use our information services and sources?

a. librarians providing reference and collection development service to faculty working on their research projects
( ) very 02 ( ) somewhat 01 ( ) not at all 00 ( ) don't know 09 ( ) n/a 08

b. UCSB Library seminars to keep faculty informed about new library resources
( ) very 02 ( ) somewhat 01 ( ) not at all 00 ( ) don't know 09 ( ) n/a 08

c. written guides on how to use the library's resources and services
( ) very 02 ( ) somewhat 01 ( ) not at all 00 ( ) don't know 09 ( ) n/a 08

d. improved signs/directories
( ) very 02 ( ) somewhat 01 ( ) not at all 00 ( ) don't know 09 ( ) n/a 08

e. articles in Daily Nexus
( ) very 02 ( ) somewhat 01 ( ) not at all 00 ( ) don't know 09 ( ) n/a 08

f. articles in Campus or departmental newsletters
( ) very 02 ( ) somewhat 01 ( ) not at all 00 ( ) don't know 09 ( ) n/a 08

g. computer-assisted library instruction
( ) very 02 ( ) somewhat 01 ( ) not at all 00 ( ) don't know 09 ( ) n/a 08

h. electronic mail between academic departments and the library
( ) very 02 ( ) somewhat 01 ( ) not at all 00 ( ) don't know 09 ( ) n/a 08

i. any future UCSB Library online catalog
( ) very 02 ( ) somewhat 01 ( ) not at all 00 ( ) don't know 09 ( ) n/a 08

j. remote terminals to access library's holdings
( ) very 02 ( ) somewhat 01 ( ) not at all 00 ( ) don't know 09 ( ) n/a 08

k. user access to data bases without the aid of a librarian
( ) very 02 ( ) somewhat 01 ( ) not at all 00 ( ) don't know 09 ( ) n/a 08

l. other, please specify _____

5. In your opinion do library staff, including student workers, need more education about where to refer users to other service points within the Library?

( ) yes 01 ( ) no 00 ( ) don't know 09 ( ) n/a 08

Comments _____

6. Do you feel you need more specific knowledge about collections/information sources in OTHER LIBRARY DEPARTMENTS to help you provide better service?

( ) yes 01 ( ) no 00 ( ) don't know 09 ( ) n/a 08

Comments _____

_____

II. USER EDUCATION/LIBRARY INSTRUCTION (includes both formal and informal orientation to library services and sources)

7. Do you feel that the following groups of users generally need more instruction in the use of the library?

FACULTY

( ) yes 01 ( ) no 00 ( ) don't know 09 ( ) n/a 08

Comments _____

GRADUATE STUDENTS

( ) yes 01 ( ) no 00 ( ) don't know 09 ( ) n/a 08

Comments _____

UNDERGRADUATES

( ) yes 01 ( ) no 00 ( ) don't know 09 ( ) n/a 08

Comments _____

8. If yes to number 7, on which aspects of library use do users need more guidance/information? (check as many as appropriate)

a. how to use the card catalog
( ) faculty ( ) graduates ( ) undergraduates ( ) don't know ( ) n/a

b. how to use the online catalog (MELVYL)
( ) faculty ( ) graduates ( ) undergraduates ( ) don't know ( ) n/a

c. how to find biographical information
( ) faculty ( ) graduates ( ) undergraduates ( ) don't know ( ) n/a

d. availability of reference materials (indexes, bibliographies) in specific discipline
( ) faculty ( ) graduates ( ) undergraduates ( ) don't know ( ) n/a

e. general information on UCSB Library
( ) faculty ( ) graduates ( ) undergraduates ( ) don't know ( ) n/a

f. the call number system
( ) faculty ( ) graduates ( ) undergraduates ( ) don't know ( ) n/a

g. how to find articles in magazines and journals
( ) faculty ( ) graduates ( ) undergraduates ( ) don't know ( ) n/a

h. how to compile bibliographies
( ) faculty ( ) graduates ( ) undergraduates ( ) don't know ( ) n/a

i. how to find serials in UCSB Library
( ) faculty ( ) graduates ( ) undergraduates ( ) don't know ( ) n/a

j. information on the availability and use of specialized collections or materials, please specify_____
( ) faculty ( ) graduates ( ) undergraduates ( ) don't know ( ) n/a

k. other, please specify

_____

9. In your opinion what are the strengths and weaknesses of the Library's current user education/library instruction program?

STRENGTHS:

WEAKNESSES:

10. What specific steps would you like to see taken to extend and improve the Library's user education/library instruction program?

11. What continuing education or new skills do you think YOU will need to develop in the next 5 to 10 years to provide adequate user education/ library instruction?

III. TECHNOLOGY/ACCESS

12. Do you feel that YOU are aware of the technology currently available in the library that would help you provide requested information? (e.g. MELVYL, RLIN, OCLC, ORION, database searching, other equipment)

( ) yes 01 ( ) no 00 ( ) don't know 09 ( ) n/a 08

Comments _____

13. Indicate any technology/equipment CURRENTLY available in the library for which you would like enhanced knowledge of/access to in order to provide better service.

14. What technology/equipment NOT CURRENTLY available in the library do you feel YOU need to provide better information and reference services?

15. What technology/equipment NOT CURRENTLY available in the library do you feel the following groups of users will need in the next 5 to 10 years?

FACULTY

GRADUATE STUDENTS

UNDERGRADUATES

IV. SERVICES/USER NEEDS

16. Does service to the various outside user groups (e.g. alumni, non-UCSB students, general public) impair or detract significantly from your ability to serve UCSB students and faculty?

( ) yes 01 ( ) no 00 ( ) don't know 09 ( ) n/a 08

Comments _____

17. What types of innovative public services in use at other academic libraries would you like to see used here? If possible, specify institution.

18. In what ways do you think the user's information needs may change in the next 5 to 10 years? If you wish, differentiate between faculty, graduates, and undergraduates.

19. If you could change, add, or improve one aspect of library service what would it be? Briefly state why.

V. GENERAL

20. What is your classification?
( ) academic ( ) classified staff
02 01

21. On the average approximately how many hours per week did you spend in direct contact with users in the last year?

( ) over 10 hours/week

( ) 6 to 10 hours/week

( ) 1 to 5 hours/week

( ) less than one hour/week

( ) none

YOU ARE INVITED TO CONTACT LYN KORENIC (x3613) IF YOU WISH TO SHARE YOUR IDEAS FURTHER WITH THIS TASK FORCE. THANK YOU FOR YOUR TIME AND CONTRIBUTION TO THE PUBLIC SERVICES STUDY!

USER NEEDS AND EDUCATION
STAFF SURVEY
NOVEMBER 1985

I. AWARENESS

1. In your opinion are users aware of the range of information and reference SERVICES offered by the UCSB Library? (e.g. computer-based literature searching, thesis advising, ILL, availability of equipment such as microform readers)

	Faculty		Graduates		Undergrads	
	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%
very	16	17	13	14	0	0
somewhat	53	58	48	52	9	10
little	9	10	13	14	64	70
don't know	9	10	7	8	12	13
n/a	3	3	6	7	3	3
blank	2	2	5	5	4	4

2. In your opinion are users aware of the range of information and reference SOURCES offered by the UCSB Library? (e.g. basic reference tools, specific collections, online databases, etc.)

	Faculty		Graduates		Undergrads	
	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%
very	21	23	17	18	0	0
somewhat	45	49	46	50	13	14
little	10	11	11	12	61	66
don't know	8	9	9	10	11	12
n/a	5	5	5	5	3	3
blank	8	9	4	4	4	4

3. How effective would the following methods be for increasing STUDENT awareness of and ability to use our information sources?

	VERY		SOMEWHAT		NOT AT ALL		DON'T KNOW		N/A		BLANK	
	NO.	%	NO.	%	NO.	%	NO.	%	NO.	%	NO.	%
a. librarians giving course-related tours/lectures in the library	35	38	42	46	6	6	3	3	3	3	3	3
b. librarians giving course-related lecture in student classes	38	41	34	37	8	9	5	5	3	3	4	4
c. librarians working with students individually on their research projects	50	54	22	24	4	4	7	8	4	4	5	5
d. students doing class-related library assignments developed by faculty and librarians	44	48	32	35	2	2	5	5	4	4	5	5
e. written guides on how to use the library's resources and services	25	27	50	54	4	4	8	9	2	2	3	3
f. articles in Daily Nexus	10	11	49	53	15	16	13	14	2	2	3	3
g. improved signs/directories	27	29	44	48	9	10	6	7	2	2	4	4
h. videotaped instructional programs geared to specific courses	20	22	41	45	9	10	15	16	3	3	4	4
i. computer-assisted library instruction	15	16	44	48	5	5	22	24	3	3	3	3
j. any future UCSB Library online catalog	26	28	32	35	7	8	20	22	3	3	4	4
k. remote terminals to access Library's holdings	28	31	38	41	6	7	12	13	4	4	4	4
l. user access to data bases without the aid of a librarian	20	22	35	38	14	15	14	15	4	4	5	5

m. other, please specify

comments	14	15%
blank	78	85%

4. How effective would the following means or methods be for increasing FACULTY awareness of and ability to use our information services and sources?

	VERY		SOMEWHAT		NOT AT ALL		DON'T KNOW		N/A		BLANK	
	NO.	%	NO.	%	NO.	%	NO.	%	NO.	%	NO.	%
a. librarians providing reference and collection development service to faculty on their research projects	47	51	26	28	2	2	8	9	5	5	4	4
b. UCSB Library seminars to keep faculty informed about new library resources	35	38	29	32	12	13	8	9	3	3	5	5
c. written guides on how to use the Library's resources and services	20	21	46	50	11	12	8	9	3	3	4	4
d. improved signs/directories	28	30	35	38	13	14	8	9	4	4	4	4
e. articles in Daily Nexus	3	3	32	35	35	38	14	15	3	3	5	5
f. articles in Campus or departmental newsletters	17	18	54	59	6	7	7	8	3	3	5	5
g. computer-assisted library instruction	12	13	45	49	13	14	13	14	5	5	4	4
h. electronic mail between academic departments and the library	19	21	35	38	13	14	18	20	3	3	4	4
i. any future UCSB Library online catalog	29	32	32	35	7	8	14	15	5	5	5	5
j. remote terminals to access library's holdings	34	37	28	30	7	8	14	15	4	4	5	5
k. user access to data bases without the aid of a librarian	29	32	35	38	7	8	10	11	5	5	6	7

l. other, please specify

comments	7	8%
blank	85	92%

5. In your opinion do library staff, including student workers, need more education about where to refer users to other service points within the library?

	NO.	%
yes	70	76
no	11	12
don't know	6	7
n/a	1	1
blank	0	0
commented	24	26
comments blank	68	74

6. Do you feel you need more specific kknowledge about collections in OTHER LIBRARY DEPARTMENTS to help you provide better service?

yes	55	60
no	23	25
don't know	3	3
n/a	9	10
blank	2	2
commented	16	17
comments blank	76	83

7. Do you feel that the following groups of users generally need more instruction in the use of the library?

FACULTY	yes	51	55
	no	17	18
	don't know	15	16
	n/a	5	5
	blank	4	4
	commented	12	13
	comments blank	80	87
GRADUATE STUDENTS	yes	61	66
	no	9	10
	don't know	14	15
	n/a	4	4
	blank	3	3
	commented	8	9
	comments blank	84	91
UNDERGRADUATES	yes	81	88
	no	1	1
	don't know	5	5
	n/a	3	3
	blank	2	2
	commented	12	13
	comments blank	80	87

8. If yes to number 7, on which aspects of library use do users need more guidance/information? (check as many as appropriate)

	FACULTY		GRADS		UNDERGRADS		FAC/GR		FAC/UND		GR/UND		F/GR/UN		DON'T KNOW		N/A		BLANK	
	NO.	%	NO.	%	NO.	%	NO.	%	NO.	%	NO.	%	NO.	%	NO.	%	NO.	%	NO.	%
a. how to use card catalog	1	1	0	0	38	41	1	1	2	2	13	13	19	21	3	3	3	3	14	15
b. how to use onling catalog (MELVYL)	3	3	0	0	16	17	1	1	2	2	6	7	40	43	9	10	2	2	13	14
c. how to find biographical information	0	0	0	0	27	29	1	1	1	1	15	16	25	27	7	8	3	3	13	14
d. availability of reference materials in specific discipline	0	0	0	0	30	33	2	2	1	1	14	15	27	29	5	5	2	2	11	12
e. general information on UCSB Library	0	0	0	0	30	33	1	1	2	2	9	10	24	26	10	11	3	3	11	12
f. call number system	0	0	0	0	44	48	0	0	1	1	7	8	13	14	4	4	5	5	18	20
g. how to find articles in magazines and journals	0	0	0	0	38	41	0	0	1	1	19	21	16	17	5	5	2	2	11	12
h. how to compile bibliographies	0	0	0	0	40	43	0	0	1	1	19	21	7	8	9	10	3	3	13	14
i. how to find serials in UCSB Library	0	0	0	0	30	33	0	0	1	1	14	15	25	27	7	8	2	2	13	14
j. information on the availability and use of specialized collections or materials	0	0	0	0	13	14	4	4	0	0	8	9	29	32	14	15	3	3	21	23

k. other, please specify

commented	8	9%
blank	83	90%

9.-11. Open-ended questions. 100% of respondents answered all three questiions.

12. Do you feel that YOU are aware of the technology currently available in the Library that would help you provide requested information? (e.g. MELVYL, RLIN, OCLC, ORION, database searching, other equipment)

yes	37	40
no	35	38
don't know	2	2
n/a	8	9
blank	10	11
commented	23	25
comments blank	69	75

13.-15. Open-ended questions. 100% of the respondents answered all three questions.

16. Does service to the various outside user groups (e.g. alumni non-UCSB students, general public) impair or detract significantly from your ability to serve UCSB students and faculty?

yes	9	10
no	51	55
don't know	6	7
n/a	14	15
blank	12	13
commented	14	15
comments blank	77	84

17.-19. Open-ended questions. 100% of the respondents answered all three questions.

20. What is your classification?

academic	30	33
classified staff	57	62
blank	5	5

21. On the average approximately how many hours per week did you spend in direct contact with users in the last year?

over 10 hours/week	45	49
6 to 10 hours/week	12	13
1 to 5 hours/week	9	9
less than one hr/wee	17	18
none	7	8
blank	2	2